VOLUME IV JANUARY, 1909 NUMBER 2

DANTE, GUIDO GUINICELLI AND ARNAUT DANIEL.

IN Dante's conversations with Bonagiunta of Lucca (*Purg.*, XXIV), with Guido Guinicelli and Arnaut Daniel (*Purg.*, XXVI) there are many difficulties, but the general argument is clear. Dante's poetical mind is concerned with the same matters to which he gives philological attention in the essay *De Vulgari Eloquentia*. Here as there he distinguishes an earlier from a later period of lyric art, both in Italian and Provençal; he claims his own place among the poets of the later, the more proficient school; he recognises Guido Guinicelli as the founder of this order in Italy and associates with him the Provençal poet Arnaut Daniel, as standing in the same sort of relation to his contemporary poets. We see clearly enough that Dante had worked out for himself a scheme of literary history in which Italian and Provençal poetry are developed in the same way, and illustrate one another through their likeness and differences. Each passes through a stage of superficial brilliance, represented, in Italy by Bonagiunta of Lucca, the Notary of Lentino, and Guittone of Arezzo; in Provençal by Guiraut de Bornelh, 'quel di Lemosì.' In each country this earlier stage is passed, and there comes a more elaborate and effective method, a loftier poetic aim—the ambitious verse of Arnaut Daniel, the 'new style' of Guido Guinicelli. In each case a popular opinion is refuted by the progress of Poesy. Guittone of Arezzo is put out of countenance by comparison with the newer school; Guiraut de Bornelh, in spite of popular favour, is not the true master among the troubadours.

One difficulty is that Dante's profession of poetic faith, in this same context, seems at first to disagree with his preference of the more learned poets:

> Io mi son un che quando
> Amore spira noto; ed a quel modo
> Che ditta dentro, vo significando.

This sounds at first like Sidney's glorious rejection of all varieties:

> I beg no subject to use eloquence
> Nor in hid ways do guide philosophie ;
> Looke at my hands for no such quintessence
> But know that I in pure simplicitie
> Breathe out the flames which burne within my heart,
> Love only reading unto me this arte.

But Dante does not speak 'in pure simplicity' and to look at his hands for 'quintessence' is no futile thing. It was precisely by this 'quintessential' mood that the new style of Guido and his followers distinguished itself from that of Bonagiunta, Guittone and the Notary. So far was the new style from simplicity that it provoked the opposition of the older school, with Bonagiunta himself as their spokesman. The place given to Bonagiunta by Dante can hardly have been chosen without some reference to the sonnet in which he challenged Guido for his laboured style:

> Ma sì passate ogn' om di sottiglianza
> Che non si trova già chi ben vi spogna
> Cotant' è scura vostra parladura[1].

The substance of the contention may be thus rendered, in prose:

Bonagiunta to Guido.

'Since you have changed the manner of the pleasing verses of love from the form and essence they had before, in order to outvie every other poet, you have done like the light that lights up dark corners, but not the sphere of heaven which has no rival in its clearness. But you outgo all men so in subtilty that no one is found to explain you, so obscure is your fashion of speech. And it is held a great anomaly, albeit that wit comes from Bologna, to utter an ode by dint of Scripture.'

Guido to Bonagiunta.

'The wise man runs not lightly but his thinking and liking are ruled by measure; when he has thought he withholds his thought till truth assures it. A man ought not to be too high-minded, but have regard to his condition and nature: the fool thinks that he alone sees the truth and does not believe that another may have concern therein. There are fowls in the air of divers fashion, not all of one flight nor one desire; they have different works and ways. God ordered Nature and the World according to degrees, and made disparity of wits and understanding: and therefore what a man thinks he shall not say.'

[1] The *tenzone* is given by Monaci, *Crestomazia*, pp. 303, 4. The phrase '*trare* canzon' (Bonagiunta, l. 14) may have been in Dante's mind, *Purg.* XXIV, 50.

It is not a gift of simple or direct expression that Dante claims. He has learned from Guido Guinicelli, and Guido's poetry can be recognised even at this distance of time by readers in a foreign country, as something new and strange, a spirit not indeed Platonic in the technical sense, like the Platonism of the Renaissance, but none the less truly allied to the doctrine of Plato, and his worship of the beauty that is above the heavens. When Dante says *Amor mi spira* the word has for him all the inextricable variety of meanings that it had gained in the philosophic school of poetry, founded by the one Guido and continued by the other, Guido Cavalcanti, with greater scholastic elaboration. It recalls to him the vicissitudes of his poetical life; all the curious allegorical play of his mind between passion and doctrine in the *Vita Nuova* and *Convivio*. It is not simple[1].

In Provençal poetry there is a contest between Guiraut de Bornelh[2] and another poet (probably Raimbaut of Orange) which Dante may possibly have remembered. Guiraut here is the advocate, like Bonagiunta, of clear poetry against the *trobar clus*, the difficult style. Though his opponent is not Arnaut Daniel in person, the theory maintained against him is that of which Arnaut had made himself the chief professor. Dante's praise of Arnaut, at first not easy to understand, and the poetical sympathy which he imagines between Arnaut and Guido, become more intelligible when it is remembered that the two poets had held similar positions in the same literary revolution.

Yet, withal, there is something very hard to solve in Dante's estimate of Arnaut. Dante not merely praises him; speaking by the mouth of Guido he gives him the supremacy; he is the chief poet of

[1] Cf. G. A. Cesareo in *Miscellanea di Studi Critici edita in onore di Arturo Graf*, Bergamo, 1903, p. 515 sqq.

[2] A. Kolsen, *Guiraut von Bornelh, der Meister der Troubadours*, Berlin, 1894; H. J. Chaytor, *Troubadours of Dante*, Oxford, 1902.

The debate runs in this way:

'Pray tell us, Guiraut, why you go blaming the harder style: do you value highly what is public and common? That would make all men equal.'

'Linhaure, I am not to blame though every poet follow his own bent; for myself I hold the song better loved and praised when the maker shapes it light and simple; bear me no grudge for this.'

'Guiraut, I would not have such verse for mine that none should love the good more than the base, the great than the petty. Fools will not praise it, for they know not nor reck not of what is most dear and precious.'

'Linhaure, why do you make poetry if you do not wish the multitude to know it? For song has no other profit.'

'Guiraut, let me only fashion the better sort and utter it, I care not whether it have vogue or no. Small grace there is in cheapness.'

(Guiraut, sol quel meills apareill
e digu' ades, e tragu' enan
me no cal, si tan no s' espan.)

love. Now Arnaut has nothing of that idealism which was the essence of the 'new style' in Italy, though he may resemble Guido in his opposition to the easier and more trivial kinds of poetry. Is one to suppose that Dante gave him his place entirely by reason of his peculiar verse and diction?

Undoubtedly part of the truth is that Arnaut appealed to Dante through the art of his verse, in the *Sestina* and other stanzas of the same type:—*sub una oda continua... sine iteratione modulationis cujusquam et sine diesi,* as it is explained by Dante, *Vulg. Eloq.*, II, 10.

The *Sestina* is the most complete and absolute among all the forms of stanza; a perfect period which cannot be greater or less, which allows no interpolation or digression but proceeds infallibly from beginning to end under its own law. Dante's respect for Arnaut is one among many examples of his love of symmetry. To Dante, a clear and exact formula was irresistible, and Arnaut's verse had carried the formula to perfection; therefore Dante admired him. This will hardly be questioned; it is plain in many other parts of Dante's writing what power there was in abstract formulas to control and fascinate his mind; how partial some of his judgments are, under the influence of abstract considerations. There is nothing unlike Dante in his preference of Arnaut for the sake of his *oda continua.* But it is to be remembered that in *Vulg. Eloq.* while he speaks of Arnaut with respect, Dante does not exaggerate his terms of praise on this account, and does not give him anything like pre-eminence among lyric poets. Also he praises Arnaut not only for his verse but for his poetical diction, which is another thing altogether, and much harder to understand. Dante's theory of lyric verse is intelligible, and likewise his praise of Arnaut's stanzas for their formal beauty. But his theory of diction is harder to understand than anything else in his works; it is scarcely possible to make out his classification of *vocabula pexa et irsuta* in connexion with the examples which he gives. However, it is plain that there is, somewhere in his theory, a principle of verbal euphony; and it is certain that no force or persuasion can make Arnaut's syllables agree with any such law. His *Winter Ode*—quoted by Dante—uses in close conjunction words like *letz, becs, mutz,* which no philology can reconcile with Dante's theory of diction:

L' aura amara
Fals bruoills brancutz
Clarzir
Quel doutz espeissa ab fuoills
Els letz

Becs
Dels auzels ramencs
Ten balps e mutz,
Pars
E non pars;
Per qu' eu m' esfortz
De far e dir
Plazers
A mains per liei
Que m' a virat bas d' aut,
Don tem morir
Sils afans no m' asoma.

The effect of this—*letz, becs, balps e mutz,*—has some likeness to Marston's *Winter Prologue*:

The rawish dank of clumsy winter ramps
The fluent summer's vein, and drizzling sleet
Chilleth the wan bleak cheek of the numb'd earth.

Milton, who laughed at Bishop Hall for a line beginning 'Teach each,' would have been as severe to this poem of Arnaut's as Dante ought to have been, on his own principles. There is ingenuity, no doubt, in the way Arnaut drills his syllables and manages his difficult pattern of verse. But the ingenuity is very like that of the trivial early poets whom Dante depreciates, and very unlike that of Dante himself. Indeed the verse of Arnaut is rather exceptionally unlike the Italian manner; the things that might be expected to win Dante's approval are not easily found in Arnaut. There is nothing of that noble harmony which Dante has described (*Vulg. Eloq.*, II, 5), the right proportion between the heptasyllable and the heroic line. In this, it is not too much to say, lies the secret of the Italian *Canzone*, as well as the elective affinity between Italian and English verse in their noblest passages. For of course the English correspondence of ten and six is the same as the Italian of eleven and seven—the same in *The Scholar-Gipsy* as in the *Epithalamion* or *Lycidas*:

Fame is no plant that grows on mortal soil
Nor in the glistering foil
Set off to the world nor in broad Rumour lies.

This prosodic form belongs peculiarly to the Italian poets; it is not French or Provençal. But it is found occasionally as if by accident in Provençal; there is only a hint of it in Arnaut:

Doutz brais e critz
Lais e cantars e voutas
Aug dels auzels qu' en lur latin fan precs.

He prefers a combination of eight and ten, which is not favoured in

Italy (nor in England). Some of his rhyming runs have a quaint effect: the verse of the *Nut Brown Maid* comes as part of a stanza:

Ges per janguoill nom vir aillor
Bona dompna, ves cui ador;
Mas per paor
Del devinaill
Don jois trassaill,
Fatz semblau que nous vuoilla;
C' anc nous gauzim
De lor noirim:
Malmes, que lor acuoilla!
(*ed.* Canello, No. II.)

This sounds well enough, to our ears, as a sort of rustic measure; but it is very unlike good Italian verse. There is a pretty stanza in III (Canello):

De drudaria
Nom sai de re blasmar
C' autrui paria
Torn ieu en reirazar;
Ges ab sa par
No sai doblar m' amia,
C' una non par
Que segunda noill sia.

As often happens with the old Provençal measures—oftener than with the Italian—there is an echo of this in English verse:

Him perfect music
Doth hush unto his rest,
And through the pauses
The perfect silence calms;
O poor the voices
Of earth from east to west,
And poor earth's stillness
Between her stately palms.

But it is not Italian; and, further, if Dante had been attracted by this kind of verse he could have found much more in other poets; there is nothing here to account for Dante's praise.

It is more to the purpose that Arnaut is distinguished among his fellows by a curious violent emphasis; this comes out in his harsh use of monosyllables, in his liking for images of winter, in the strength of his protestations. He is the least attractive, at first, of all the Provençal poets; he has little of the beauty that is in Bernart de Ventadorn, and he is generally far away from the delightful freedom and grace of the earlier poems, like the *Farewell* of William of Poitiers (*Pos de chanter m'es pres talens*, Bartsch, *Chrestomathie*, 32) or Marcabrun's *A la fontana del vergier* (*ibid.*, 49). His emphasis (sometimes at least) is equally far from the conventional rhetoric of the troubadours, and in his power of enforcing what he says he is not unlike Dante:

'I pray my song may not be grievous to you, for if you will welcome it, words and tune, little recks Arnaut whom it may please or pain.' 'Love bids me not be like the violet, that passes quickly long before the winter comes, but for the sake of her love to be laurel or juniper.'

Naturally one turns to the poems quoted by Dante to find what he admired in them. That which is quoted in *Vulg. Eloq.*, II, 6: 'Sols sui qui sai lo sobrafan quem sortz,' is enough to prove at any rate the vehemence of Arnaut's rhetoric. Take it at the lowest valuation—take it as a game of words merely—still there is in it a force of will, not wholly unlike Dante. He may protest too much, but he is not weak. He seems to suspect that his language may be taken for pretence, and he maintains his earnestness:

'To look on others I am blind, and deaf to hear them; without her I cannot see nor hear, and this I say not in vain conceit'—*e jes d' aisso noill sui fals plazentiers.*

His extravagances of passionate language do not go off into the air—

> To o'er top old Pelion or the skyish head
> Of blue Olympus—

but come back to strengthen his imagination, to give weight to his charge; as in this same poem later: 'Though Rhone in all his flood runs strong, that flood is mightier that makes my heart a lake of love.' It is this habit of thought—this concentration and repeated attack—which justifies the *Sestina* and makes it more than a toy. It is, literally, an *involved* sort of verse, in which the involution and evolution are one—it rolls round on itself, the extremes coming into the centre, and at the same time it throws out new fringes, till the period is complete. This concentration of the *Sestina* and its repetition of the same words, make it the proper verse for the melancholy man—and that both Arnaut and Dante were of this humour can hardly be questioned. It is in the *Pietra* poems—not in the *Sestina* only—that the likeness between the two poets is brought out. The strange thing is that this kind of love-poetry, in which there is no thought of Beatrice, no vestige of Guido Guinicelli, should be praised as it is by Dante; for there is nothing more exalted to be found in Arnaut, and yet Arnaut is put forward (by Guido himself in the *Purgatorio*) as the chief poet of love, and that very shortly before the meeting of Dante and Beatrice, very shortly after the passage about the 'new style.' The *formal* merit of Arnaut will not explain everything, though it is part of the explanation. Dante's praise is unconditional; Arnaut surpassed all others, all the lyric poets and all the romances of love. Dante is thinking of the French romances in

which the Provençal lyric sentiment and grace were turned into narrative; he is thinking of Lancelot and Guinevere. The reference to the romances proves (I think) that however Dante may have admired the formal processes of Arnaut (*sub una oda continua*) it was not for that reason only that he preferred him here. You can compare Arnaut with the authors of *versi d' amore,* if it please you, in point of form. But you cannot compare him with *prose di romanzi* (if by those is meant the noble and joyous book of Lancelot) except with regard to the matter, and the matter is the doctrine of love. The formal motive is not enough; Dante meant to praise more in Arnaut than the pattern of his stanza; and the difficulty remains. There is some likeness in Arnaut to Dante; but nothing of the peculiar virtue which Dante found in Guido Guinicelli, and reverenced in Guido as the source of his own poetic life.

W. P. Ker.

London.

COURT PERFORMANCES UNDER JAMES THE FIRST.

In *The Modern Language Review* for October, 1906, I called attention to some neglected entries in the Declared Accounts of the Treasurer of the Chamber, which made it possible to establish a more complete list of dramatic performances at the court of Elizabeth than had formerly been available. I will now add a few entries from the same source (*Pipe Rolls*, 543 and 544) for the reign of James the First up to the death of Shakespeare in 1616. The new information which they furnish is comparatively scanty, inasmuch as the extracts from the Original Accounts already printed by Peter Cunningham in the Introduction to his *Extracts from the Accounts of the Revels at Court* (1842) are more exhaustive for this period; but they are not uninteresting, since they help in a small way towards the disentangling of the somewhat complicated histories of the dramatic associations to which they relate, and, in particular, of those known generically as the Revels companies.

As before, I give, in the case of each performance, the name of the company, the date of the performance so far as it can be ascertained from the entry, and in brackets the name of the representative of the company to whom payment was made by the Treasurer of the Chamber upon a duly signed warrant. The earlier warrants were issued, in accordance with the practice of Elizabeth's reign, by the Privy Council as a whole; but in 1615 this responsibility was transferred to the Lord Chamberlain. Plays at court were not always performed before the King in person, and it is therefore desirable to record which members of the royal family were present on each occasion. The entries are scrupulous as to this, for the very sufficient reason that, if the King attended, the ordinary fee of £6. 13*s.* 4*d.* was increased by a 'reward' of £3. 6*s.* 8*d.*, making a total payment of £10 for each play.

Feb. 20, 1604 (King). Children of Paul's (Edward Pearce).

Edward Pearce, or Peirs, who had been a Gentleman of the Chapel since 1588, resigned his place, upon appointment to the Mastership of the Children of Paul's, in 1600 (Rimbault, *Old Cheque Book of the Chapel Royal*, 4, 5). He seems to have at once revived the Paul's plays, which had been 'dissolved' since 1590. He had twice brought the boys to court during the last reign, on January 1, 1601, and January 1, 1603. It is just possible that Salmon or Salathiel Pavy, for whom Death's self was sorry, originally belonged to this company. He is described as 'apprentice to one Peerce' in the bill of complaint which records how he and other boys were pressed for the Chapel by an abuse of the commission given to Nathaniel Giles (Fleay, *History of the Stage*, 128).

Christmas, 1608–9 (King). Children of the Blackfriars (Robert Keyser). Two plays.

Jan. 4, 1609 (King). Children of the Blackfriars (Robert Keyser) 'in the Cockpitt at Whitehall.'

This Cockpit, which formed part of the palace of Whitehall, and probably stood on the site of the present Treasury building at the Westminster end of the Horse Guards Parade, is not to be confused with the theatre of that name, built about 1617 in Drury Lane. Prince Henry's Privy Purse Accounts for 1610–12 record several payments 'for makinge readie the Cockepitt for playes' (Cunningham, XIII).

Dec. 26, 1609 (King). Prince Henry's (Edward Juby).

Dec. 27, 1609 (King). Queen's (Thomas Greene).

Dec. 28, 1609 (King). Prince Henry's.

Jan. 7, 1610 (King). Prince Henry's.

Jan. 18, 1610 (King). Prince Henry's.

Christmas, 1609–10 (King, Queen, Henry, Charles, Elizabeth). King's (John Heminges). Thirteen plays.

Christmas, 1609–10 (King, Henry). Children of the Whitefriars (Robert Keyser). Five plays.

There were twenty-four plays in all this Christmas. Mr Fleay, who explains (*H. of S.*, 173) that there were 'no plays before the King or Queen on account of the plague,' is therefore a little unlucky. The virulence of the plague always subsided in the winter, and I do not know of any year in which it made plays at court altogether impossible.

The payments to Robert Keyser, on behalf of the Children of the Blackfriars in 1608–9 and the Children of the Whitefriars in 1609–10, require special notice. Keyser is not a wholly new figure in dramatic

annals. It was to him, as 'his many waies endeered friend,' that Walter Burre dedicated Beaumont and Fletcher's *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* in 1613, with a preface in which he relates how Keyser saved the rejected play from 'perpetuall oblivion,' and sent it to him some two years before its publication. Dr H. S. Murch, the latest editor of *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, tells us that 'nothing is ascertainable regarding Robert Keysar' (*Yale Studies*, XXXIII, 106). Even apart from the entries which I am now for the first time making known, this is not strictly accurate. The papers in the Chancery suits of *Evans v. Kirkham* and *Kirkham v. Painton and Others* in 1612 (Fleay, *H. of S.*, 249) include a pleading of Edward Kirkham, in which he describes the profits which he and his partners derived from their interest in the great Hall of the Blackfriars, and how, at a certain stage of their relations with the company that performed there, 'the said Children, which the said Evans in his aunswere affirmeth to be the Queenes Cheldren, were Masters themselues, and this complaynante & his said partners receiued of them and of one Kezar, who was interest wth them, aboue the summe of one hundred and ffiftye poundes *per annum*, onely for the vse of the said great Hall, wthout all manner of charges.' The company referred to by Kirkham is no doubt that to which the Treasurer of the Chamber's payments of 1608–9 and 1609–10 were made. The documents of the lawsuit, intricate and full of controversy as they are, render it possible to reconstruct the history of the Blackfriars from 1600 to 1608 with fair certainty. They are absolutely consistent with such collateral information as can be gleaned from the *Blackfriars Sharers Papers* of 1635 (Halliwell-Phillipps, *Outlines of the Life of Shakespeare*, I, 312) and other sources. The Chapel plays at the Blackfriars began in 1600. Very few writers are clear about this, and the date is constantly placed anywhere from 1596 onwards. But the statement of the Burbages in the *Sharers Papers* is explicit, that the playhouse 'was leased out unto one Evans that first sett up the boyes commonly called the Queenes Majesties Children of the Chappell'; and *Evans v. Kirkham* gives the date of that lease as September 2, 1600. There had of course been earlier Chapel performances, during the Masterships of Richard Edwards (1563—1566) and William Hunnis (1566—1597). These had ceased, so far as the court was concerned, in 1584 (*Modern Language Review*, II, 7), but the company can be obscurely traced in the country, at any rate until 1591. Two of their plays, *Dido* and *The Wars of Cyrus*, were published as late as 1594. On June 9, 1597, Nathaniel Giles became the Master of the Children (Rimbault, 5).

But there was no immediate resumption of plays. James Burbage had bought the Blackfriars premises from Sir William More and had adapted them for the purposes of a theatre in the previous year; but the use of the said house for plays had been forbidden by the Privy Council (*Malone Society Collections*, I, 91), and although the difficulty was evaded by making it a 'private' house, there is no reason to suppose that this took place earlier than 1600. It is worth noticing that a conveyance by Sir George More to Cuthbert and Richard Burbage of some additional property in the Blackfriars, bordering on their father's original purchase, is dated June 26, 1601 (*Hist. MSS. Comm.*, VII, 659). The Treasurer of the Chamber's books record a performance of the Chapel at court, for the first time since 1584, on January 6, 1601 (Cunningham, XXXIII). Mr Fleay is of course the will-o'-the-wisp who has led recent writers astray. He says, 'The Chapel children had been playing in public from 1597 onwards' (*H. of S.*, 124); and a little later, of the Blackfriars, 'There is no trace of any performance there until November, 1598, when The Case is altered, by Jonson (his earliest play), was acted by "the children of the Blackfriars"' (*H. of S.*, 153). I need not dwell upon the inconsistency of the two dates; let us come to the evidence. 'That witty Play of *the Case is altered*' is mentioned in Nash's *Lenten Stuff*, which was entered in the Stationers' *Register* on January 11, 1599, and it must therefore have existed in some form by that date. *The Case is Altered* was published, in a text bearing clear traces of revision, during 1609, 'As it hath beene sundry times Acted by the Children of the Blacke-friers.' But the fact that the Children of the Blackfriars had acted the play by 1609 is no proof that it was originally produced by them in 1598, even if it could be shown that the name 'Children of the Blackfriars' was in use at all at that date. It may have been produced by some other company and transferred to the Children of the Blackfriars. Precisely this thing happened to Chapman's *All Fools*, which was originally written for the Admirals in 1599 and was printed in 1605 as 'presented at the Black Fryers' (Greg, *Henslowe's Diary*, II, 203). Such evidence cannot stand for a moment against the clear proof from the lawsuits of 1612 and 1635 that Evans first set up the Chapel plays under the lease from the Burbages of 1600. And there is no other evidence.

Henry Evans financed the Chapel under some arrangement with one James Robinson and with Nathaniel Giles, the Master. There were performances at Court during the Christmasses of 1600–1 and 1601–2, for which Giles received payment from the Treasurer of the Chamber.

Jonson wrote *Cynthia's Revels* and *The Poetaster* for the 'aery of little eyases,' and they 'berattled the common stages' with a light heart. But the enterprise was not a success. During the first few months the syndicate got into trouble with the Star Chamber for an illegitimate use of Giles' commission in pressing children for the company. Under Articles of Agreement dated April 20, 1602, Edward Kirkham, who, by the way, was Yeoman of the Revels, and others were brought in as partners with Evans and his son-in-law Alexander Hawkins; but almost immediately afterwards there was a quarrel. According to Evans, he was libelled by Kirkham and his friends to Lord Chamberlain Hunsdon, and had to leave the country. The company did not appear at Court during the Christmas of 1602–3, and the plague of the following summer hit the profits very hard. On January 31, 1604, authority was given for a patent, under which the company changed its name and became the Children of the Revels to the Queen. The old name of Children of the Chapel was not wholly dropped out of popular use, but it would seem that the Master of the Children ceased to be officially concerned with the plays. When Nathaniel Giles' commission was renewed in 1626, a special proviso was inserted that none of the Children should be employed in plays, 'for that it is not fitt or desent that such as should sing the praises of God Almighty should be trained or imployed in such lascivious and profane exercises' (Collier, *H. E. D. P.*, I, 446). The patentees for the Revels were Edward Kirkham, Alexander Hawkins, Thomas Kendall, and Robert Payne. Samuel Daniel was appointed to license plays for the Children, and no reservation seems to have been made for the rights of the Master of the Revels. All went well for a while. The company performed at court on February 21, 1604, and twice during January, 1605. Payment was made for the former year to Edward Kirkham as 'M^{r} of the Children of the Queenes Ma^{ties} Revells,' and for the latter to Samuel Daniel and Henry Evans. Evans, therefore, must have come home, and resumed his share in the direction. But before long the enterprise fell upon troublous times. Misdemeanours, for which Evans declared that Kirkham was especially responsible, were committed in the plays. The King forbade the use of the house in future and some of the boys were sent to prison. These facts are recorded in the lawsuit papers, but with no clear indication of their date. It is probable that the summary account given in the pleadings really covers a series of satirical indiscretions and of consequent reconstructions of the company, which lasted over a period of about three years. The first misdemeanour was probably the production

of Daniel's *Philotas* in 1604. Then followed that of *Eastward Ho* in 1605, which, as we know from other sources, brought the authors, Jonson, Marston and Chapman, into prison, and within measurable distance of losing their ears. There were no court performances by the company at the Christmas of 1605–6, and Kirkham appears as payee for that year on behalf of the Paul's boys (Cunningham, XXXVIII). Marston's *Parasitaster* and Middleton's *Trick to Catch the Old One* seem to have been originally produced at Blackfriars and afterwards transferred, no doubt at this time, to Paul's. But the Paul's plays themselves cannot be traced beyond 1606, and afforded no permanent scope for Kirkham. It is clear, on the other hand, that the Blackfriars performances were resumed, and that further misdemeanours preceded the final inhibition referred to in the lawsuit. There is, indeed, definite evidence of at least three more offending plays, before James' patience was exhausted. One was Day's *Isle of Gulls*, of which Sir Edward Hoby, writing to Sir Thomas Edmondes about events in mid-February, 1606, says (Birch, *Court and Times of James the First*, I, 60):

> At this time was much speech of a play in the Black Friars, where, in the 'Isle of Gulls,' from the highest to the lowest, all men's parts were acted of two divers nations; as I understand sundry were committed to Bridewell.

The other two are mentioned in a letter of April 8, or in English style March 30, 1608, from the French ambassador, M. De La Boderie, to M. De Puiseux at Paris. As this reference is generally quoted from an English translation of an imperfect German summary, frequently misdated in 1605, and sometimes ascribed to the wrong ambassador, I give it in full from *Ambassades de Monsieur De La Boderie en Angleterre* (1750), III, 196. The original is in *B. N. MS. fr.* 15984.

> Environ la mi-Carême, des Comédiens à qui j'avois fait défendre de jouer l'histoire du Maréchal de Biron, voyant toute la Cour dehors, ne laisserent de la faire, et non seulement cela, mais y introduiserent la Reine et Madame de Verneuil, traitant celle-ci fort mal de paroles, et lui donnant un soufflet. En ayant eu avis de-là à quelques jours, aussi-tôt je m'en allai trouver le Comte de Salisbury, et lui fis plainte de ce que non seulement ces compagnons-là contrevenoient à la defense qui leur avoit été faite, mais y ajoutoient des choses non seulement plus importantes, mais qui n'avoient que faire avec le Maréchal de Biron, et au partir de-là étoient toutes fausses. Il se montra fort corroucé, et dès l'heure même envoya pour les prendre. Toutefois il ne s'en trouva que trois, qui aussi-tôt furent menés à la prison où ils sont encore; mais le principal qui est le compositeur, échapa. Un jour ou deux avant, ils avoient dépêché leur Roi, sa mine d'Ecosse, et tous ses Favoris d'une étrange sorte; car aprés lui avoir fait dépiter le Ciel sur le vol d'un oiseau, et fait battre un Gentilhomme pour avoir rompu ses chiens, ils le dépeignoient ivre pour le moins une fois le jour. Ce qu'ayant sçu, je pensai qu'il seroit assez en colere contre lesdits Comédiens, sans que je l'y misse davantage, et qu'il valoit mieux faire referer leur châtiment à l'irrévérence qu'ils lui avoient portée, qu'à ce qu'ils

pourroient avoir dit desdites Dames ; et pour ce, je me résolus de n'en plus parler, mais considérer ce qu'ils ont fait. Quand le Roi a été ici, il a témoigné être extrêmement irrité contre ces marauds-là, et a commandé qu'ils soient châtiés, et sur-tout qu'on eût à faire diligence de trouver le compositeur. Même il a fait défense que l'on n'eût plus a jouer des Comédies dedans Londres. Pour lever cette défense, quatres autres Compagnies, qui y sont encore, offrent déja cent mille francs, lesquels pourront bien leur en ordonner la permission ; mais pour le moins sera-ce à condition qu'ils ne représenteront plus aucune histoire moderne, ni ne parleront des choses du temps à peine de la vie. Si j'eusse cru qu'il y eût de la suggestion en ce qu'avoient dit les Comédiens, j'en eusse fait du bruit davantage ; mais ayant tout sujet d'estimer le contraire, j'ai pensé que le meilleur étoit de ne point le remuer davantage, et laisser audit Roi la vengeance de son fait. Toutefois si vous jugez de de-là, Monsieur, que je n'en aye fait assez, il est encore temps.

I do not know what the play on James may have been ; that on Biron was evidently Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* (1608, *S. R.*, June 5, 1608), which was purged of its scandalous episode and published as 'acted at the Black-Friers,' but without the name of a company. The Byron disaster brought about a crisis in the affairs of the Blackfriars. The lawsuit papers make it clear that by July 26, 1608, no plays were being used at the house, and that on or about that date Kirkham had the property of the syndicate valued and divided amongst the partners, gave up his commission under the great seal, i.e., the patent of 1604, and discharged divers of the partners and poets. Evans then considered the association at an end, and surrendered the lease of the Blackfriars to the Burbages, who, as we learn from the *Sharers Papers*, placed there men players, 'which were Heminges, Condall, Shakspeare, etc.' Kirkham challenged Evans' right to do this, and so the lawsuits of 1612 arose.

So far as the actors were concerned, the Blackfriars company was probably a continuous one from 1600 to 1608; and it seems to have had a remarkable gift of surviving its disgraces. It was not, however, included amongst the companies performing at court, after its first misdemeanour of 1605, and there is reason for believing that, as a result of that misdemeanour, it lost the special patronage of the Queen, and was thenceforward known, not as the Children of the Queen's Revels, but simply as the Children of the Revels. The title-pages of two plays, Day's *Isle of Gulls* (1606) and Sharpham's *The Fleir* (1607, *S. R.*, May 13, 1606), indicate that they were acted 'by the Children of the Revels' and 'in the blacke Fryars.' A third play, Day's *Law Tricks* (1608, *S. R.*, March 28, 1608), was also 'Acted by the Children of the Revels,' but the Blackfriars is not mentioned. I do not think that we have to do with a mere accidental variation. The title-pages of all other Blackfriars plays published from 1601 to 1606, if they bear the

name of a company at all, bear that of the Children of the Chapel (Jonson's *Cynthia's Revels*, 1601, and *Poetaster*, 1602; *Sir Gyles Goosecappe*, 1606) or that of 'the Children of her Maiesties Revels' (Marston's *Dutch Courtezan*, 1605; Chapman, Jonson, and Marston's *Eastward Ho*, 1605), or 'the Children of the Queenes Maiesties Revels' (Marston's *Parasitaster*, 1606), or 'her Maiesties children' (Chapman's *Monsieur D'Olive*, 1606).

It is not an unreasonable conjecture that the change of organisation, whereby the Children, with Robert Keyser as 'interest wth them,' became 'Masters themselves,' was in its turn due to a later attempt to escape the penalties of one of their misdemeanours. If it is true, as Evans deposed, that Kirkham was chiefly responsible for the wrong-doing, it may well have become desirable that he should retire from the active management of the company. It would also seem that another change of name took place, whereby the Children of the Revels became the Children of the Blackfriars. But it is not quite clear at what exact point this reconstruction is to be fitted into the history. It would be natural to place it in the autumn of 1608, on the ground that, if Keyser had been responsible for *Byron* and for the satire on James in the previous spring, he would hardly, even if he was allowed to resume playing, have been invited to bring the Children to court, for the first time since 1604–5, at the Christmas of 1608–9. But Kirkham's reference to Keyser's company in the course of the lawsuit certainly suggests that they had been paying rent to him and his partners for the Blackfriars during a period earlier than the wind-up of the association in July, 1608; and it is also a possibility that the crisis which brought Keyser into the management was that due to the production of *The Isle of Gulls* in February, 1606. This conjecture receives some support from Keyser's connection with *The Knight of the Burning Pestle*, for the production of which the winter of 1606–7 is by far the most probable date. It is, of course, often assigned to 1610–11. This is because, after explaining in the dedicatory Epistle that Keyser sent him the play two years before its publication in 1613, Walter Burre proceeds, 'Perhaps it will be thought to bee of the race of Don Quixote: we both may confidently sweare, it is his elder aboue a yeare.' Nobody supposes that *The Knight* is either older than, or independent of, the First Part of the Spanish *Don Quijote*, published in 1605; and Burre has generally been interpreted as referring to Thomas Shelton's English translation. This was entered in the Stationers' *Register* on January 19, 1612, and if it were the date of publication of which *The Knight* had the advantage

by a year, the production of the play would no doubt fall in the winter of 1610–11. But then Burre's boast would be rather an idle one, for Shelton states quite plainly in his preface that the translation was actually made 'some five or six yeares agoe.' As Mr Fitzmaurice-Kelly has proved that it was based upon the Brussels edition of 1607 it must have been made in 1607–8; and if the claim of priority for *The Knight* has any real meaning, this cannot be later than 1606–7. The conclusion precisely agrees with the only other indication of date in the play. In the sixth line of the *Induction*, the Citizen says, 'This seuen yeares there hath beene playes at this house.' The house can only have been the Blackfriars, since the Whitefriars is not heard of until 1608, and the Blackfriars, as already shown, was opened in the winter of 1600.

Whether it was in 1606 or in 1608 that Keyser's company originated, they were sufficiently in favour, as the Treasurer of the Chamber's account shows, to appear at court under the name of the Children of the Blackfriars during the Christmas of 1608–9. It must have been just at this time that the occupation of the Blackfriars by the King's men left them homeless. And now it is that the Whitefriars comes into the story, since by good fortune it was just empty and available to receive them. What little is known about the early fortunes of the Whitefriars is derived from the records of yet another law-suit, that of *Androwes v. Slater* (*N. S. S. Transactions*, 1887–92, 269). The house was a mansion belonging to Lord Buckhurst, and stood next to the Revels Office. In March, 1608, a lease of it was held by Michael Drayton and Thomas Woodford, who also owned the books and dresses of 'the Children of the revells there being'; and a partnership was formed to run the company, consisting of Michael Drayton, Lording Barry, George Androwes, William Trevell, William Cooke, Edward Sibthorpe, John Mason, and Martin Slater. The manager was to be Martin Slater, and it was agreed that, 'when their pattent for playinge shalbe renewed,' his name should be joined in it with Drayton's, to enable him to travel with the children in times of restraint. Slater had been a member of the Admiral's men from 1594–7. He often appears in Henslowe's *Diary* under his Christian name only (Greg, II, 310); and therefore he may well have been the Martin who in November 1599 was travelling with Laurence Fletcher, afterwards of the King's men, in Scotland (*Scottish Papers*, II, 777). In 1603 he was payee for Lord Hertford's men (*Modern Language Review*, II, 12), and in 1605 he was acting with Queen Anne's men (*Hist. MSS.*, XI, 3, 26). The enterprise was a failure, partly no doubt because of the *Byron*

inhibition, which extended to all companies, and partly because the plague rendered plays an impossibility in London from August to November of 1608; and the lease was forfeited for non-payment of rent. Litigation followed in February between Slater and Androwes, who had been persuaded to spend £300 upon building and other expenses. This Revels company, playing at the Whitefriars during 1608, must clearly be distinct from the boys who appeared at court as the Children of the Blackfriars at the end of that year. It makes up, with the King's, the Queen's and the Prince's, the sum of four companies mentioned by M. De La Boderie as endeavouring to buy off the inhibition, and is doubtless to be identified with the Children of the King's Revels, who are not known to have performed at court at all, but who are recorded upon the title-pages of several plays published between 1607 and 1611. These are Sharpham's *Cupid's Whirligig* (1607, entered in the Stationers' *Register* on June 29, 1607), Middleton's *The Family of Love* (1608, *S. R.*, October 12, 1607), Day's *Humour Out of Breath* (1608, *S. R.*, April 12, 1608), Markham's *The Dumb Knight* (1608, *S. R.*, August 6, 1608), Armin's *Two Maids of Moreclack* (1609), Mason's *The Turk* (1610, *S. R.*, March 10, 1609), and Barry's *Ram Alley* (1611, *S. R.*, November 9, 1610). It will be observed that the authors of the two plays which came last to publication were members of the 1608 syndicate, and are otherwise little known. I am afraid that the sight of their lucubrations on the boards was about all they got for their money. The play-list also makes it clear that the company must have existed in 1607, and indeed the account of the 1608 transactions implies as much. The incidental reference in the lawsuit to 'the Children of the revells' is obviously not inconsistent with their full name having been Children of the King's Revels; but it at least suggests that there was no other Revels company in existence, and helps to confirm the inference that Keyser's boys did not call themselves Children of the Revels. I do not find any reference to Drayton's theatrical speculation in my friend Professor Elton's excellent monograph upon the playwright and poet. Another of the partners, Thomas Woodford, was afterwards interested in the Red Bull theatre (Fleay, *H. of S.*, 195). Mr Fleay, not having the *Androwes v. Slater* documents before him, thinks that 'the Paul's boys ceased to act in 1607,' that the children of the King's Revels, who succeeded them, 'were the same company under another name,' and that they acted at the Paul's singing school (*H. of S.*, 152, 188, 202, 206). It is apparent now that they acted at the Whitefriars; and there is really very little to suggest a connection with Paul's. Neither

Kirkham nor Pearce belonged to the 1608 syndicate, and although Middleton wrote both for Paul's and the King's Revels, Middleton, Sharpham and Day wrote for the King's Revels and for the Blackfriars Revels company. So far as the evidence goes, which is not far, it seems more likely that the King's Revels arose out of an independent attempt in 1606 or 1607 to capture the popularity of the Blackfriars company after their disgrace through *The Isle of Gulls*, in rivalry with Kirkham and Keyser, who were doing their best to continue the company under a new name at the Blackfriars itself. It cannot, by the way, be shown that the Paul's plays lasted into 1607. Their last recorded performance was that of *Abuses* before James and Christian of Denmark on July 30, 1606 (Nichols, *Progresses*, II, 68 ; IV, 1074). It is true that Beaumont and Fletcher's *Woman Hater* (1607, *S. R.*, May 20, 1607) was published as ' lately acted by the Children of Paules,' but ' lately ' hardly excludes a date in 1606, and the other evidence produced for the production of the play in 1607 is very thin. Mr Fleay further states that the King's Revels ' acted from 1607 to 1609 ' and that the Duke of York's men arose ' immediately after the disappearance of the King's Revels Children ' (*H. of S.*, 152, 188). *Androwes v. Slater* shows that the King's Revels were broken before February, 1609, and the patent for the Duke of York's men is dated March 30, 1610 (*Shakespeare Society Papers*, IV, 47). But as a matter of fact they had been playing in the country a year or two earlier (*Hist. MSS.*, IX, 1, 248).

I return to Keyser's company. Having been Children of the Blackfriars at Christmas 1608–9, they must have moved to the Whitefriars when they were dispossessed by the Burbages in the course of the same winter, and thus became Children of the Whitefriars at Christmas 1609–10. They remained at the Whitefriars; but not for long under the management of Keyser. On January 4, 1610, they were reconstituted as ' Children of the Revells to the Queene,' under a new patent granted through Sir Thomas Monson's influence to Robert Daborne, Phillip Rosseter, John Tarbock, Richard Jones and Robert Browne. The acting manager was Phillip Rosseter, one of the King's musicians, a ' lutenist ' who wrote some of the music for Thomas Campion's *Book of Airs* (1601) and dedicated it to Monson. Thus there was once again a Queen's Revels, for the first time since 1605. I do not here propose to follow the fortunes of this company further, but before returning to the Treasurer of the Chamber's accounts, it is perhaps worth while to ask whether it is possible to construct a list of the plays which Keyser may be supposed to have produced. I am afraid that the answer is not

altogether satisfactory. The only play published as 'acted by the Children of the Blacke-friers' is Jonson's *The Case is Altered* (1609, *S. R.*, January 26, 1609). This and *The Knight of the Burning Pestle* I have already discussed. There are six plays published from 1608 to 1613, whose title-pages indicate that they were played either at the Blackfriars, or at the Whitefriars, or at both houses, but name no company. These are Middleton's *Your Five Gallants* (*S. R.*, March 22, 1608), Chapman's *Conspiracy and Tragedy of Charles Duke of Byron* (1608, *S. R.*, June 5, 1608), *Mayday* (1611), *Widow's Tears* (1612, *S. R.*, April 17, 1612), and *Revenge of Bussy d'Ambois* (1613, *S. R.*, April 17, 1612), and Marston's *Insatiate Countess* (1613). But such a title-page leaves it possible that the play, even if it belongs to the original Revels company in one of its many transformations, may be earlier or later than Keyser's reign, and I have not at present room to examine other evidence. It is worth noting that *Your Five Gallants* is assigned in the Stationers' *Register* to 'the Children of the Chapel.' Evidently this name endured in popular usage long after it had ceased to have any official significance. Even the Treasurer of the Chamber applies it to Rosseter's company as late as 1613 (Cunningham, xlii). I think Keyser must have produced Jonson's *Epicoene* as well as *The Case is Altered*. But the evidence is a little puzzling. The entry in the Stationers' *Register* on September 20, 1610, names neither company nor theatre. Alleged editions of 1609 and 1612 probably do not exist; but Jonson himself wrote in the Folio of 1616, 'This Comoedie was first acted, in the yeere 1609. By the Children of her Maiesties Revells.' Now Prof. Thorndike (*The Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere*, 17) has sufficiently proved that Jonson invariably uses the Circumcision style and not the Annunciation style in the Folio, and that consequently '1609' means 1609 and not the early part of 1610. On the other hand, if the name 'Children of her Majesty's Revels' was really first revived by Rosseter, Jonson must have forgotten the fact. *Epicoene* has an actor-list, which must be held to give us the composition of Keyser's company, and probably, for the matter of that, of Rosseter's as well. The 'principall Comoedians' were 'Nat. Field, Gil. Carie, Hug. Attawel, Ioh. Smith, Will. Barksted, Will. Pen, Ric. Allin, Ioh. Blaney.' Field had of course been an original member of the Chapel Children in 1600. With Jonson, Chapman and Beaumont, Field contributed verses to Fletcher's *Faithful Shepherdess*, which was printed without date, but almost certainly before May, 1610. The play, stated by Jonson in 1618 or early in 1619 to have been written 'ten years

since' (*Conversations with Drummond*, 17) may reasonably be assigned to Keyser. I will now conclude this long excursus with a chronological summary of what I conceive to have been the succession of the events with which it deals. It is, of course, nothing but an hypothesis which the discovery of further material may very likely destroy.

Summer 1600. Children of Paul's begin plays under Edward Pearce.

Autumn 1600. Children of the Chapel begin plays under Henry Evans.

April 1602. Edward Kirkham and others enter into partnership with Evans.

January 1604. Children of the Chapel become Children of the Queen's Revels. They are soon in disgrace for *Philotas*.

1605. Queen's Revels are in disgrace for *Eastward Ho* and lose royal patronage. Kirkham transfers his services to Paul's, but continues Blackfriars company as Children of the Revels.

February 1606. Revels are in disgrace for *Isle of Gulls*. Kirkham transfers management of his boys to Keyser, who conducts them as the Children of Blackfriars.

Autumn 1606. Paul's plays end.

1607. Children of King's Revels are established at Whitefriars.

March 1608. Children of Blackfriars are in disgrace for *Byron*. They resume playing in the winter, but meanwhile Evans surrenders Blackfriars lease to the Burbages, who place the King's men there. The King's Revels fail.

1609. Keyser's company move house and become Children of the Whitefriars.

January 1610. Rosseter takes over Children of the Whitefriars as Children of the Queen's Revels.

The Treasurer of the Chamber is now resumed.

Christmas 1614–5 (Charles). Prince Charles' (William Rowley). Six plays.

For this year, the dates of the warrants (April and May, 1615) are the only indications of the period within which the performances fell. Mr Fleay (*H. of S.*, 188, 262) says that about April 1614 Prince Charles' men 'were amalgamated with the Lady Elizabeth's men under Henslow at the Hope,' and Mr Greg (*Henslowe's Diary*, II, 138) substantially adopts the same view. I think that this payment, when taken with that for the same year to Nathan Field on behalf of the Lady Elizabeth's men (Cunningham, XLIV), tends to discredit it, so far as 1614–5 is concerned.

Christmas 1614–5 (King). Queen's (Robert Leigh). Three plays.
Christmas 1614–5 (King, Charles). Palsgrave's (Edward Juby). Three plays.

The Elector had taken over the patronage of Prince Henry's men, after the death of the latter on November 7, 1612.

Christmas 1614–5 (King). King's (Heminges). Eight plays.

Cunningham (XLII) misdates the warrant on May 19, 1613, instead of 1615. There were, therefore, only twenty plays by the King's men in 1612–3, not twenty-eight.

Nov. 1, 1615—April 1, 1616 (King and Queen). King's (Heminges). Eight plays.
Christmas 1615–6 (King). Queen's (Robert Lee). Four plays.
Christmas 1615–6 (Charles). Prince Charles' (Alexander Foster). Four plays.

The warrants for the Queen's and Prince's men are dated in April and May 1616. The appearance of Alexander Foster, who belonged to the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1611–3, as payee for Prince Charles', renders it possible that the amalgamation assumed by Mr Fleay and Mr Greg had actually taken place for 1615–6. When Rosseter obtained authority to build a new playhouse at Porter's Hall in the Blackfriars on May 31, 1615, it was contemplated that both the Prince's players and the Lady Elizabeth's players would use the house, as well as the Children of the Revels; and in fact Field's *Amends for Ladies* (1618) was 'acted at the Blacke-Fryers, both by the Princes Servants, and the Lady Elizabeths.' This, however, suggests alternate, rather than joint playing. On March 20, 1616, the Prince's men were certainly treating with Alleyn as a distinct company (Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, 90); and Alexander Foster was not a member.

E. K. CHAMBERS.

LONDON.

MARLOWE AT CAMBRIDGE.

In spite of the investigations and happy speculations of the Rev. Dr H. P. Stokes—the fruits of which are mostly to be found in his *History of Corpus Christi College* (1898) and in Mr John H. Ingram's interesting if hardly judicial book *Christopher Marlowe and his Associates* (1904)—a good deal of obscurity has continued to hang over the years of Marlowe's life at Cambridge. When did he come up? was he a scholar of his College, and if so, on what foundation? how regularly and how long did he reside? who were his chamber-fellows?—some of these questions at any rate have not yet been definitely answered. I propose to answer them in this paper, based on a close examination of the accounts of Corpus Christi College kindly allowed me by the Bursar, Mr A. J. Wallis, to whom I here desire to express my obligations.

The first certain date in connexion with Marlowe's residence at Cambridge is that of his matriculation as a member of the University. In the list of matriculations preserved in the University Registry, under the date March 17, 1580–1, and in the column headed 'convictus secundus' (i.e., the list of students matriculated neither as fellow-commoners nor sizars), appears the entry 'Coll. corp. x^{r}. Chrōf. Marlen.'

How long before this had Marlowe been in residence at his college?

From the fact that he took his bachelor's degree in March 1583–4 one would expect him to have come up to Cambridge at the beginning of the Michaelmas Term of 1580. He would then have fulfilled, if not the twelve terms prescribed by statute before admission to the B.A. degree, at least the ten terms plus a part of a term which was accepted as a sufficient substitute. I believe however that, as a matter of fact, he came up to Cambridge early in the term after Christmas. A MS. called the 'Registrum Parvum' (now bound with the oldest College Order book or 'Liber Actorum') gives a list of students admitted to the College as pensioners ('Pencionarij in scholarium cōmeatu'), and in this list the name 'Marlin' (as will be seen from the facsimile given by Mr Ingram, p. 56) occurs last but one among those admitted in the

year 1580, i.e., before March 25, 1580–1. This gives a presumption that the admission took place in the Lent Term. Further, as Mr Ingram mentions, a regulation had been made in 1579 obliging students to matriculate within a month of entering a College, and it is to be presumed that, at a date so soon after, this regulation was more or less literally observed[1]. Lastly, as we shall see, Marlowe though not yet formally elected a scholar received 12*s.* this quarter from the scholarship which he held afterwards—and this implies that he had resided twelve weeks before March 25. I conclude therefore that he came into residence not long after Christmas 1580: and that his loss of the previous term was somehow condoned when he came to take his degree.

For his first term then, Marlowe was a pensioner of his College, but drawing the allowance granted to a scholar. He had evidently come up with a nomination to a scholarship and had only to wait to be formally admitted. The date of this ceremony is given us in another entry in the 'Registrum Parvum,' under the heading 'Nomina Scholasticorum.' This entry has hitherto, I think, been overlooked[2]: '1581. Maii 7. Marlin electus et admissus in locum dni Pashley[3].'

On admission to a scholarship a student paid a fixed fee to the College. We accordingly find in the College Accounts[4] for the year ending Michaelmas 1581 in a list of payments 'Pro introitu in Convictum $\overline{\text{mri}}$ et socior. et scholarium' the entry 'Marlin iij^{s} iiij^{d}[5].'

What was the scholarship which had been held by Pashley and to which Marlowe succeeded? The answer to this question gave me some trouble, and to save trouble to others, I will go into the facts a little closely. If I say more than is necessary for the purpose of elucidating the life of Marlowe, I hope it will be taken as a small contribution to College history.

In the year 1560 the only scholarships tenable at Corpus Christi College were six which had been founded in 1548 'ex benevolentia $\overline{\text{mri}}$ et sociorum.' Each scholar, says Masters[6], 'was to have after

[1] Dr Stokes used these arguments to enforce the same conclusion in a letter to the *Athenæum*, Sept. 1, 1894. The regulation referred to is printed in Heywood and Wright's *University Transactions*, I, 222.

[2] Dr Stokes in his *History of C. C. C.*, p. 84, speaks of Marlowe's going to Cambridge 'perhaps as the first holder of the Canterbury scholarship which John Parker had just founded in the name of his late father, the Archbishop.'

[3] Christopher Pashley (or Pashlie) matriculated as pensioner of Corpus June 15, 1575, B.A. 157$\frac{8}{9}$, M.A. 1582.

[4] The College Accounts referred to in this paper are found in a volume labelled 'Audits etc. 1575–1590.'

[5] Pensioners, as will be seen from the same list, paid an admission fee of xii^{d}. As Marlowe never paid this, it is clear that he was regarded from the beginning as virtually a scholar.

[6] *History of C. C. C.* (1753), p. 200.

the rate of 8*d.* per week for commons, a small allowance *per ann.* for Landress and Barber, together with a Chamber and his Reading in the Hall free.' The weekly sum allowed for commons was subsequently augmented successively to 10*d.* and 12*d.*

Some years later Archbishop Parker founded an additional scholarship partly out of the effects of John Mere, of whose will he was a supervisor, partly from the voluntary contributions of himself and others[1]. The first mention of this scholarship in the College Accounts occurs in those of the year ending Michaelmas 1565[2].

In 1567, by an indenture dated June 24, Parker founded three scholarships the holders of which were to be nominated by the Mayor and Aldermen of Norwich and to be called 'Norwich scholars.' These scholarships seem to have been first held in the year 1567–1568, as the accounts of that year show a leap in the sum spent on scholars from xi^{l} ii^{s} to xxiij^{li} xii^{s} xi^{d}. This is however perhaps partly to be accounted for by a rise in the weekly allowance for commons.

The accounts of the next year show a further rise in the sum devoted to scholarships, which now amounts to xl^{li} xj^{s} vj^{d}. This is owing to fresh foundations made by Parker. By an indenture of May 31, 1569[3], he established three 'Canterbury scholars' to be nominated by the Dean and Chapter out of Canterbury School—the money for the maintenance of these scholars coming from some tenements in Westminster. By one of May 22 he founded two more scholarships from the revenues of the Hospital of Eastbridge, Canterbury. By one of August 6 he founded two additional Norwich scholarships—the holders to be nominated by the Dean and Chapter from the schools of Norwich, Wymondham and Aylsham. The Eastbridge scholars were at first coupled in the College Accounts with the three Canterbury scholars. Thus in this year, 1569, we have the entry

> 'Et in denār. solut. pro co*mina*bus quinq*ue* Scholasticor*um* Norwic. et quinq*ue* aliorum Scholasticor*um* Cantuar. p*ar*tim ex reddit. Westmōn. et Estbrige iux*ta* xii^{d}.'

The weekly sum paid to each scholar has now risen, as we see, to 12^{d}. The accounts of this year give the names of the five Norwich scholars (Pickering, Golde, Leeds, Bradley, Fowler) and of the five

[1] Masters, *ibid.*, p. 85.
[2] Masters' date (p. 200) must be incorrect, whether he means that Mere was 'Bedle' in 1569 or that the scholarship was founded in that year.
[3] Strype, *Life of Parker*, p. 290.

Canterbury and Eastbridge scholars (Scott, Thacster, Braine, Cotton, Nychols).

Things remained at this point till the year 1575 when the College Accounts show that Parker had founded three more scholarships. The different groups of scholars (apart from those on the foundation of the Master and Fellows or on that of Mr Mere) are now divided into

5 Norwich scholars.

5 'ex reddit*ibus* West*monasterij* et partim ex reddit*ibus* de Estbrige[1].'

3 ex fundacione Matthei Archiepiscopi Cant*uariensis* 'iuxta xii[d] in sept*imana* pro rata residentiæ cuiusque eorum in Colle*gio*' (Thexton, Poynter, Pashley).

What do we know of this last foundation?

Archbishop Parker had died on May 17 of this year, 1575. In his will made on April 5 preceding[2] he had provided for the creation of three more scholarships. Clause 16 runs as follows:

'Item volo quod Executores mei paratum reddant cubiculum in eo collegio (sc. Corporis Christi) jam vocatum *A Storehouse*, pro tribus aliis meis scholasticis inhabitandis, pro quibus singulis volo tres libras & sex solidos octoque denarios per annum dari, juxta formam quam Executores mei scripto suo praescribent. Quorum Scholasticorum primum electum volo per successores meos in Schola *Cantuar.* & in ea urbe oriundum: Secundum electum volo è Schola de *Aylesham*: & tertium è Scholâ de *Wymondham*: In hiis duabus villis oriundos[3].'

Strype tells us that the Archbishop's purpose was carried out '*per chartam* 7° Augusti 20 Q. Eliz. [i.e., 1578]'—while Masters[4] seems to imply that nothing was done till 1580 when the Archbishop's son, John Parker, Esq., founded three scholarships in accordance with his father's will, but reserved the nomination of the scholars to himself during his life. But the College Accounts seem to prove that the scholarships had been created immediately after the Archbishop's death. While the three scholarships which we find entering into the accounts of Michaelmas 1575 correspond exactly to those established by the will, the accounts of the years from 1576 to 1590 show no trace of any fresh

[1] In 1580 and subsequent years these are made into two groups, one 'fundat. per reddit. ex hospitali Eastbridge (2),' the other 'fundat. ex reddit. ten*emen*torum in Westmonasterio (3).'

[2] The will is printed by Strype, *ibid.*, Appendix, p. 188.

[3] Strype, Appendix, p. 191, gives 'A list of bequests...paid for the said Archbishop' from the MSS. of Rev. N. Battely. Here we find 'To Bennet College for three Scholars £200.' Unfortunately the list is not dated.

[4] p. 202.

foundation except one created by Sir Nicholas Bacon in 1577, for which payments first appear in the accounts of Michaelmas 1578.

In the accounts of the year 1575–1576 and in those of subsequent years the three scholars of Parker's last foundation are grouped, not with the Canterbury scholars, as might have been expected, but with the five Norwich scholars. Under the heading 'pro stipendio octo scholastic*orum* ex fundacione Matth. Cantuarien.' occur eight names, Goold, Goldinge, Plumb, Abse, Dix, Thextone, Poynter, Pashley. The first five we know from previous records to have been the Norwich scholars, the last three are the scholars of the last foundation.

This grouping was preserved till the year 1590, at any rate.

We may now keep our eyes on the scholars of the last foundation. All of them appear with the prefix 'D.' (Dominus, the title of a B.A.) in the fourth quarter of 1578–1579, Lewgar replaces D. Poynter in the third quarter of 1579–80 (he had been admitted to the scholarship on April 12, 1580[1]), and 'Marlin'[2] replaces D. Pashley in the second quarter of the year 1580–1581. His name had even appeared in the list of scholars for the first quarter of that year, but this had apparently been an error. In that quarter the name is crossed out, and 'Pashlye' written above.

Marlowe then, though perhaps rightly called a 'Canterbury scholar,' was not one of the earlier foundation. He came under the provisions of the scholarships founded by Archbishop Parker's will, and evidently held that scholarship which was reserved for a native of Canterbury educated there in the Free School. He was probably nominated to the scholarship by Mr John Parker, the Archbishop's son. I have not seen the 'charta' referred to by Strype[3] nor any other documents describing the qualifications which Parker demanded in these scholars and the advantages conferred on them. I must be content therefore to follow Masters who tells us that the qualifications demanded of the scholars of the last foundation as well as the allowances and residence prescribed for them were much the same as those of the Norwich scholars. The latter, as we hear, were to be born of honest parents, and to be chosen between the ages of 14 and 20, being first well instructed in grammar, able to write and sing, and if it might be to make a verse. They were to enjoy their exhibitions for six years, if they should be disposed to enter into holy orders, otherwise no longer than three. Upon their admission the College was to provide chambers for them and make them the like allowance as to other scholars. No scholar was to be

[1] College Order Book.
[2] His admission through some neglect was not recorded in the Order Book.
[3] See preceding page.

absent more than a month in the year, and that with leave, and whatever profits arose from vacancies, were to be employed upon napery and necessaries for their table.

Strype adds[1]: 'For the more Convenience and Benefit of the Scholars founded by him, [Parker] afterwards Anno 1574 allotted them Chambers in the College, and procured them several Books to be used in common by them in their studies. The Chambers were on the East side of the College for three of which (if no more) the Archbishop provided Implements, viz. Beds Mattresses Bolsters and Coverlids of Tapistry Chairs and Tables, that is, one of each sort belonging to each Chamber, which cost him Ten Pound Eight Shillings. The Books which were for the common use of all the six[2] Norwich Scholars were chained, and remained within the Under-Chamber of the Tenth Chamber on the East side. And they were these:

Textus Bibliæ cum Gloss. Lyræ in quatuor Voluminibus.

Novum Testamentum Græcum, cum Versionibus Vulgat. & Erasmi.

Paraphrasis Erasmi Super Novum Testament. in duobus Voluminibus Latinè.

Concordantiae Bibliorum.

Lexicon Græco-Latinum, recognitum An. 1562.

Thesaurus Linguæ Roman. & Britannic. per Thom. Cooper Anno 1565.

Thesaurus Linguæ Latin. in tribus Voluminib. recognit. Anno 1561.

Lexicon Latino-Græc. Anno 1554.

Historia Antiquitat. Cantabrigiæ. Anno 1574.'

As we do not know more definitely the conditions laid down by Parker for his new scholars, we must assume with a certain reservation that the above conditions applied to them. We do know that while the Norwich scholars were to occupy the three ground-floor chambers on the east side of the quadrangle (the present Old Court), the new scholars were to reside in a chamber previously called the Storehouse, that is, the ground-floor room at the north-west angle of that court, marked A in the plan in Willis and Clark's *Architectural History*, vol. IV[3]. That then is where Marlowe must have taken up his abode with his chamber fellows Thexton[4] and Leugar[5].

[1] p. 291.

[2] Strype includes in the six a Bible-clerk.

[3] This is clear from Josselin's *Historiola*, ed. Clark, 1880, p. 24.

[4] Robert Thexton or Thexston matriculated as pensioner of Corpus June 15, 1575, B.A. $157\frac{8}{9}$, M.A. 1582. Probably son of the vicar of Aylsham (Masters' *List*, p. 48).

[5] Thomas Leugar, B.A. $158\frac{3}{4}$, M.A. 1587. There is no record of his matriculation.

We have seen that every scholar was to receive xii^{d} a week, but it was 'pro rata residentiæ cuiusque eorum in collegio.' Hence if we know what sum a scholar received in any given quarter, we know for what proportion of that quarter he had been in residence. He could only receive 13^{s}—(in the fourth quarter, for some reason, 14^{s} seems to have been the maximum)—if resident for all his weeks. If he received less than this, we know that his residence had been short in proportion. Marlowe was credited with his scholarship from the second quarter (the Lent Term) of 1580–1581 to the second quarter of 1587 (inclusive). For all these years, except for the year 1585–1586, the College Accounts are preserved, and register the payments made to him. Accordingly we obtain a most interesting knowledge of the extent of his residence.

I now give the facts in regard to the three scholars of Parker's last foundation during Marlowe's time.

1580–1581	in 2^{a} Trimestri	3^{a} Trim.	4^{a} Trim.
	D^{s} Thexton xiij^{s}	D^{s} Thexton xiij^{s}	D^{s} Thexton x^{s}
	Leugar xiij^{s}	Leugar xiij^{s}	Leugar iij^{s}
	Marlin xii^{s}	Marlen xiij^{s}	Marlen xij^{s}

Accordingly, if our data are correct, Marlowe had resided in College from the beginning of the year to Michaelmas with the exception of one week or perhaps two in the last quarter. (In that quarter some other scholars receive xiiij^{s}.)

1581–1582	in 1^{a} Trim.	2^{a} Trim.	3^{a} Trim.	4^{a} Trim.
	D^{s} Thexton xii^{s}	D^{s} Thexton / Mondey[1] } xij^{s}	Mondey ii^{s}	Monday xiiij^{s}
	Lewger xiij^{s}	Lewger xiij^{s}	Lewger viij^{s}	Lewger ii^{s}
	Marlin xiij^{s}	Marlin xiij^{s}	Marlin xiij^{s}	Marlin vij^{s}

In this year Marlowe seems to have resided continuously from Michaelmas to the following summer and then have absented himself for six or seven weeks.

1582–1583	in 1^{a} Trim.	2^{a} Trim.	3^{a} Trim.	4^{a} Trim.
	Munday xij^{s}	Munday xj^{s}	Munday iij^{s}	Munday xi^{s} vj^{d}
	Lawgar iiij^{s}	Lewger xiij^{s}	Lewgar ix^{s}	Lawgar xi^{s}
	Malyn xij^{s}	Marlin xiij^{s}	Marlin vj^{s}	Marlin xiiij^{s}

[1] The 'Registrum Parvum' has the entry 'Maii 11. Monday electus et admissus in locum dni Thexton.' The date is 1581, but probably 1582 is meant. In this case Monday like Marlowe drew his allowance before being formally admitted to his scholarship. D^{s} Thexton had been admitted a Fellow on February 5 (College Order Book). Monday is not the John Munday who was Senior Fellow of C. C. C. in 1626 and whose election to the Mastership was quashed, but Thomas Monday, matriculated as Sizar of Corpus March 1, 15$\frac{7}{8}\frac{8}{0}$, B.A. 1583. He had perhaps been Marlowe's schoolfellow at Canterbury (Ingram p. 38). One would have expected him to come from Aylsham or Wymondham, but perhaps no candidate was forthcoming from one of these schools.

Here Marlowe breaks his year's residence for seven weeks between Lady Day and Midsummer.

1583–1584 in 1ª Trim.	2ª Trim.	3ª Trim.	4ª Trim.
D Munday xij^{s}	D Monday x^{s}	D Monday iii^{s}	Cokman[1] iiij^{s}
D Lewgar xij^{s}	D Lewgar viij^{s}	D Lewgar viij^{s}	D Lewgar xiij^{s}
D Marlyn xij^{s}	D Marlin xiij^{s}	D Marlyn xiij^{s}	D Marlin xj^{s} vi^{d}

Here Marlowe can only have been absent for a week or so in the first quarter, perhaps towards Christmas, and for a fortnight in the summer.

It will be noticed that he receives the prefix denoting the B.A. degree in the first quarter of the year. This is a natural mistake, or anachronism, on the part of a bursar making up his accounts at the following Michaelmas. As a matter of fact Marlowe only became B.A. at the end of the second quarter of this year. The 'supplicat' preserved in the University Registry runs as follows—(where words are included in square brackets part of the original document has been cut away):

'Supplicat Christopherus Marlin ut d[uodecim ?] termini completi in quibus ordinarias lectiones audiuit (lice[t non omnino] secundum formam Statuti) una cum omnibus oppositionibus r[esponsionibus] cœterisque exercitijs per statuta regia requisitis sufficiant ei [ad respon]-dendum quæstioni.

Thomas Harris pr[ælector].'

Mr Ingram gives a facsimile of the page of the University Grace-Book of the same date which shows 'Marley' in the order of his seniority.

To return to the scholarship payments. The next record is as follows:

1584–1585 in 1ª Trim.	2ª Trim.	3ª Trim.	4ª Trim.
D^{s} Lewgar	D^{s} Lewgar	D^{s} Lewgar	D^{s} Lewgar
D^{s} Marlin iij^{s}	D^{s} Marlin vij^{s} vj^{d}	D^{s} Marlin iiij^{s}	D^{s} Marlin v^{s}
Cockman xij^{s}	Cockman xiij^{s}	Cockman iij^{s}	Cockman xiiij^{s}

In this year of bachelorhood Marlowe was absent on the average more than half of every quarter, while his fellow-scholar Lewgar was apparently not in Cambridge at all.

The records for 1585–1586 are wanting.

[1] William Cockman matriculated as Sizar of Corpus Oct. 13, 1582, B.A. 158$\frac{5}{6}$, M.A. 1589.

Then we have:

1586–1587

in 1ª Trim.	2ª Trim.	3ª Trim.	4ª Trim.
Dˢ Lewgar	Dˢ Lewgar iiˢ	(name omitted from list)	
Dˢ Marly ixˢ	Dˢ Marlye vˢ vjᵈ	(name omitted from list)	
Dˢ Cockman xiijˢ	Dˢ Cockman xjˢ	Dˢ Cockman	Dˢ Cockman xiiijˢ

Marlowe was in residence for rather more than half his weeks between Michaelmas 1586 and Lady Day 1587. He had then drawn his scholarship for six full years, not counting that first term before his election and admission, and in accordance with Parker's prescriptions (in the case of the Norwich scholarships, at least) it now came naturally to an end. To have held it for even six years, if Parker's wishes were observed, Marlowe must have given out that he intended to take holy orders. If he was next heard of as a writer for a London playhouse, one may imagine that the College authorities would look on him with some disfavour.

However, though no longer a scholar, he had perhaps resided a few more weeks before taking his M.A. degree in July. The 'supplicat' preserved in the University Registry runs as follows:

'Supplicat venerentijs vestris Christophorus Marley vt nouem termini completi (post finalem eius determinationem) in quibus lectiones ordinarias audiuit (licet non omnino secundum formam statuti) vna cu*m* omnibus oppositionibus responsionibus ceterisque exercitijs p*er* statuta regia requisitis sufficiant ei ad incipiendu*m* in artibus.

Robertus Norgate
Henricus Ruse prælector.'

Dr Robert Norgate (who died 2 Nov. following) was Master of Corpus Christi College during the whole of Marlowe's time there.

Mr Ingram gives a facsimile of the page of the University Grace-Book for 1587 in which the M.A.'s of the year appear in the order of their seniority. Those 'Ex coll. corp. $\overline{\text{xpi}}$.' include 'dno Thome Lewgar' and 'Chr. Marley.'

No successor to Marlowe in his scholarship was elected for some months. Under the date 'A° 1587 Noueb. 10$^{\text{th}}$' the 'Registrum Parvum' has the entry 'Bridghman eletus [sic] et admissus in locum donj Marley.' But apparently some hitch occurred, or there is a mistake in our documents, for the College Order Book dates Bridgeman's admission five months later. Under the date 'Vicesimo septimo Aprilis Anno 1588' it

has the record 'Jacobus Bridgman[1] electus et admissus est discipulus huius Collegij in locum Cantuariensis scholaris vacantem quia M. Parker secundum ordinationem Domini Archiepiscopi patris sui alium ad supplendum locum prędictum tempore constituto ad collegium non miserit.' A further discrepancy occurs when we find from the accounts that 'Bridgman' has already paid his iii^{s} iiij^{d} 'pro introitu' (his fee on succeeding to a scholarship) in the year ending Michaelmas 1587. This would make us think that the entry in the Order Book should be dated 1587. Even so, however, the 'Registrum Parvum' would leave us with a difficulty. The records of the quarterly payments to scholars for the year 1587–1588 are unfortunately missing. Bridgeman is however in the place where we should expect him—among the eight scholars partly Norwich, partly the three of the last Parker foundation —in the first quarter of 1588–1589.

It is noticeable that the formula of the Order Book omits Marlowe's name, though it is usual in such a formula of admission that the name of the late holder of the scholarship should be stated. Is this an indication that Marlowe was in some way in bad odour with the College authorities?

It will be observed that the statement in the Order Book about Mr John Parker's failure to send up a scholar, is a further proof that the scholarship held by Marlowe was one on Parker's last foundation.

The new information afforded by the College Accounts will probably be found interesting in several respects. I will call attention to one small point, that of the spelling of the poet's name. The accounts though kept year by year by different bursars are singularly consistent in giving it up to Michaelmas 1585 as Marlin, Marlen, Malyn or Marlyn. After the missing year 1585–1586, they give it in 1586–1587 as Marly, Marlye. The College Order Book in recording his admission as a pensioner in '1580' calls him Marlin, as also when recording his admission to his scholarship in May 1581. The University record of his matriculation in 1580–1 has Marlin, the supplicat for his B.A. degree in 1583–4 has the same form, but the entry in the Grace-Book of that date has 'Marley.' The supplicat for his M.A. degree in 1587 and the entry in the Grace-Book have Marley. It looks as if he had regularly used the name Marlin in his first years of residence, but had come to adopt Marley later. He is 'Christopher Marley of London' when giving his recognizance to appear to answer a charge on October 1,

[1] James Bridgman matriculated as Sizar of Trinity June 18, 1586, M.A. (Corpus) 1593, S.T.B. 1600. There is no record of his bachelor's degree.

1588[1]. Peele in the prologue to his *Honour of the Garter* written a month after Marlowe's death addresses him as 'Marley, the Muses' darling for thy verse.'

On the other hand he was entered in the Canterbury baptismal register in 1564 as 'the Sonne of John Marlow'[2] and this apparently was the form used by his father and mother, though his father was sometimes called by others 'John Marley' or 'Marlyn[3].' The earlier records of the family at Canterbury seem to alternate between 'Marley' and 'Marlowe.' It remains therefore a puzzle why the poet should have allowed himself to be known as Marlin during the early years of his Cambridge life, and a little strange that after that name was discarded he should have been known indiscriminately as 'Marley' and 'Marlowe.'

One other conclusion seems to be indicated by the facts given in the College Accounts. Marlowe could not well have found time to serve in the Low Countries in any of the years for which we have information, though we may, if we like, imagine him to have taken a term or two off for this purpose in the year 1585–6 of which we know nothing. This however is unlikely. Nor can we suppose that he went abroad after taking his M.A. degree in July 1597. If *Tamburlaine* appeared in that year, Marlowe must at once have plunged from the quiet Old Court of Corpus into the bustling Bohemian life of the London playhouse.

I am indebted to the Master and Fellows of Corpus Christi College for their kind permission to publish the above facts.

[Postscript. I might have mentioned that Marlowe's name appears in a document in the British Museum (Lansdowne MS. 33. 43) entitled 'Nomina Professorum, et Auditorum, omnium Artium, et Scientiarum in Vniuersitate Cantabrigia Anno Regni Elizabethæ vicesimo tertio 29° die Octobris Anno Domini 1581.' While 'D. Thexton' heads the list of Corpus men who were hearing lectures in Philosophy, Mathematics and Greek, Munday comes 15th, Leugare 19th and 'Merling' 27th among the 29 hearing lectures in Dialectic or Logic. Nine junior students are entered for Rhetoric.]

G. C. Moore Smith.

Sheffield.

[1] *Middlesex Sessions Roll*, ed. Jeaffreson, I, 189 (quoted by Mr Sidney Lee in the *Athenæum*, Aug. 18, 1894).
[2] See the facsimile given by Mr Ingram, p. 21.
[3] Ingram, pp. 17, 265, 266, 267, etc.

SHORT STORIES AND ANECDOTES IN SPANISH PLAYS.

Brief narratives, called *cuentos, cuentecillos, ejemplos, ejemplicos, historias,* or *consejas*[1], abound in the Peninsular drama of the Golden Age, despite the rash generalisation of a recent writer, whose name need not be recalled. 'Fables and anecdotes,' he avers, 'are so rarely found in Spanish literature of this time that it is worth while to draw attention to their occurrence in the *Donado*' (a novel published in 1624). It may be doubted, on the contrary, whether any other modern literature, including medieval sermonology, has such a well-nigh inexhaustible storehouse of anecdotes and fables[2]. In few plays are short stories wholly wanting: some have as many as half a dozen, and Calderón even took occasion to parody the practice in *Dicha y desdicha del nombre,* where Tristán indulges in them as freely as his cousin german, Sancho Panza, in proverbs—and like the proverbs of Don Quixote's squire, the stories are not always pat to the purpose.

We are all familiar with the example in Calderón's *Life is a Dream* (1)[3]. It is related of a philosopher that he was so poor that he sustained himself on herbs. 'Can there be anyone,' he said to himself, 'poorer and sadder than I?' And when he turned round, he found a reply on seeing another philosopher picking up the leaves which he had cast aside.

Cuentan de un sabio, que un día
Tan pobre y mísero estaba,
Que sólo se sustentaba
De unas yerbas que cogía.
¿Habrá otro (entre sí decía)
Más pobre y triste que yo?
Y cuando el rostro volvió,
Halló la respuesta, viendo
Que iba otro sabio cogiendo
Las hojas que él arrojó.

[1] Doubtless also *patrañas, fábulas, fablillas,* etc.

[2] Fables will be discussed elsewhere: but it may be noted here that historians of Spanish literature have wholly overlooked countless precious gems, some of which do not suffer by comparison with Juan Ruiz's masterly renderings.

[3] To facilitate reference, the stories are numbered.

This *décima*[1] is typical of what the late Archbishop Trench characterised as 'little fables or other narratives, compositions perfectly rounded and complete in themselves, [which] occur not infrequently in Calderón[2]'—and, of course, in other dramatists. So concise and artistically contrived are these anecdotes or stories in cameo, that they arrest the attention even of those who only care to sip in Spanish dramatic literature, and the wonder is that they have been neglected so long. Sr Menéndez y Pelayo, in his recent history of the Spanish novel, which is sufficiently comprehensive in scope to include *facezie*, never even alludes to them. A considerable garner will be found, however, in two volumes of 'stories, thoughts and witticisms from Tirso, Moreto, Lope de Vega, Calderón and Alarcón,' published some years ago by Eduardo Bustillo and Eduardo de Lustonó[3]; but their collection is amateurish and far from complete. Another somewhat more pretentious collection is Jiménez y Hurtado's *Cuentos españoles contenidos en las producciones dramáticas de Calderón, Tirso, Alarcón y Moreto, con notas* [!] *y biografías*, Madrid, 1881.

It is my purpose here to rehabilitate these waifs of a bygone century. Those who deem such *nugae* unworthy of so much labour need only be reminded that no sharp distinction can be made between anecdote and story, that a poet like Dante did not disdain to give artistic form and setting to a mere anecdote about Trajan, that similar narratives have often suggested very pretentious productions, to cite only Jean Aicard's most recent play, *Le Manteau du roi* (*Der König im Bade*).

It was probably Lope de Vega who popularised *cuenticillos*. As early as 1598, Juan de Ochoa seems to allude to their insertion in plays, when he says, addressing dramatists:

> Y de un librillo, *Alivio de viandantes*,
> Hurtáis los dichos y sacáis concetos[4].

That collections of anecdotes like Timoneda's, Cruz's and others, were thoroughly ransacked by dramatists in search of material is an axiom. The following parallel versions will show how thinly veiled the poet's theft remained. In Melchor de la Cruz's *Floresta Española*, Chap. VI, we read:

[1] Calderón's source was probably Juan Manuel's *Conde Lucanor* (X), ed. Knust, p. 323.
[2] *Life's a Dream*, 1856, p. 223.
[3] *Galas del ingenio*, Madrid, s.a. (1890 ?).
[4] That is, if the book referred to is Cristoforo Zabata's *Diporto de' viandanti*, or Timoneda's *Alivio de caminantes*. There remains the possibility that Ochoa refers to plots.

Uno, que era tuerto de un ojo, topó una madrugada, quando quería amanecer, á un corcobado, y díxole: Compadre, de mañana habéis cargado. Respondió el corcobado: Por cierto sí, de manaña es, pues vos no tenéis abierta más de una ventana.

Rojas Zorrilla versified the anecdote in the following manner (II):

Un día al amanecer
Dijo un tuerto á un corcovado:
Muy de mañana ha cargado
Vuesarced al parecer.
Ya se ve que es de mañana,
Dijo el corcovado al tuerto,
Pues que vuesarced no ha abierto
Más de media ventana.

Obligados y ofendidos, Act I[1].

It is significant that Cervantes indulged but sparingly in the new vein. His *Don Quixote* and other works abundantly attest familiarity with *exempla*, but in his dramatic works there is only one instance of an anecdote such as we are concerned with here. It occurs in *La entretenida*[2], a comedia that is conceived, moreover, in the manner of the Lope school, as Cervantes understood it.

In form, the *cuentecillo* owed much, at the outset, to classical models like Anacreon's *Love stung with a bee*, or Martial's *On Euclides*. The medium may have been Italian, especially as Alamanni and other cinquecentists were very prolific in compositions of this kind. One of Lope's versions of Anacreon's epigram cited above is as follows (IX):

Una vez dicen que Amor
Quiso coger un panal,
Y una abeja, al mismo igual,
Le dió notable dolor.
Quejóse á su madre bella,
Y ella entonces le replica:
'También tu eres cosa chica,
Y das tal dolor con ella[3].'

[1] The same *Floresta* was probably the source of the following narratives: (III) A mistake arising out of the use of the words *albardas* and *alabardas* (Cruz, VII, i, 24; Lope, *La llave de la honra*, I, XV). (IV) How a student secured lodging when the innkeeper's wife was in the throes of parturition (Cruz, IX, i, 1; Tirso de Molina, *El castigo del penséque*, I, iv). (V) The retort of a lady whose *trancera* was fairer than her *delantera* (Cruz, XI, iv, 7; Tirso, *La celosa de sí misma*, I, iii). (VI) The preacher who sent his servant to a butcher called David (Cruz, v, i, 1; Calderón, *Dicha y desdicha del nombre*, II). (VII) A widow and the *caroza* (Cruz, IV, vii, 1; Calderón, *ibid.*, II), etc.

[2] (VIII) *Pidióle á una fregona...* (Act III).

[3] *El testimonio vengado*, II, iii. Lope offers another version in *Pobreza no es vileza*, III.

Needless to say, this most famous of idylls—Theocritus' (?) designation—was very popular in Spain. Among other versions made during the seventeenth century may be noted Quevedo's and Manuel de Villega's. Italian renderings (by Alamanni, etc.) and some at least of the many French versions (by Ronsard, Belleau, Baïf, etc.) were, not unlikely, accessible in the Peninsula.

The practice of repeating stories may be further illustrated by the following references: (X) Jupiter (variant Venus) and the man who loved a cat (Lope, *El Príncipe perfeto*, II, xiv, and *El Castigo sin Venganza*, III). (XI) One who fed on poison became sick when the supply was exhausted (Calderón, *Saber del mal y del bien*, I. iv, and *Para vencer á amor, querer vencerle*, III). (XII) Ono who was mending his breeches, when asked what

It will be in order now to take up stories individually. In Mira de Mesqua's *El Martir de Madrid,* licensed September 3, 1619, occurs one (XIII) of a captive who would in ten years teach an elephant to speak. When asked how, he replies that at the expiration of the time set, he himself, the king, to whom the boast had been made, or the elephant would be dead:

Tengo el exemplo delante
del que se obligó á los daños
sino enseñaba en diez años
á hablar un elefante:
que diciendo otro cautibo,
¿cómo te puedes librar
si en efeto a de llegar
el término executibo?
risueño le respondió
.....[1]
que alguno se moriera,
el rey, elefante, o yo:
y ansí el negocio ha finado[2].

In 1616 Lope de Vega dramatised this anecdote in *El Príncipe perfeto*[3]. As he had been anticipated by Cervantes, it may be well to present the two versions in full. Lope's rendering is as follows:

Letrado. Advierto
Una cosa extraña y nueva.
¿Es bien que mi habilidad
Tan peregrina se pierda?
Rey. ¿En qué la tienes?
Letrado. Escucha:
En que, fuera de mis letras,
Haré tan notables cosas,
Que será la menor dellas
El hacer que un elefante
Hable nuestra propia lengua.
Rey. ¡Un elefante!
Letrado. ¿Eso dudas?
Intenta, Señor, la prueba
Con los que Gama[4] ha traido,
O á mil muertes me condena.
Rey. ¿En qué término le harás
Hablar?
Letrado. Diez años.
Rey. Pues sea:
Él y el elefante estén
Presos, mientras que le enseña.
Alcalde (*ap. al Letrado*). Hombre, ¿qué es lo que habéis dicho?
¿Cómo intentáis tal quimera?

was the new(s), replied, nothing but the thread (Calderón, *Dicha y desdicha del nombre,* I, and *Nadie fie su secreto,* III), etc.

[1] This line is defective in my copy.

[2] MS. Biblioteca nacional, Madrid, fol. 56 (2) vo.

[3] Ed. Rivad., p. 135. It may be noted here, as a trifling addendum to the Rennert-Chorley bibliography (p. 527), that a third part was promised. See close of the play (in Vol. IV, not Vol. II).

[4] Vasco de Gama, the navigator.

Letrado. Callad, Alcalde, ¿no veis
Que en diez años que me quedan
De término, es impossible
Claramente que no muera
Yo, ó el Rey, ó el elefante?

Cervantes' version forms the sub-plot of *La gran Sultana*, published in 1615. In Act II a captive, Madrigal by name, appears before a judge (in Lope's play the king acts in the same capacity) and, in order to free himself, says:

Y aquel valiente elefante
Del Gran Señor, yo me ofrezco
De hacerle hablar en diez años
Distintamente turquesco;
Y cuando de esto faltare
Que me empalen, que en el fuego
Me abrasen.

On being released, he is reminded by Andrea that he himself does not speak Turkish, but he retorts:

Habrá tiempo en diez años
De aprender el turco y griego.
Andrea. ¿Al cabo no has de morir,
Cuando caigan en el caso
De la burla?
Madrigal. No hace al caso;
Déjame agora vivir;
Que en término de diez años,
Ó morirá el elefante,
O yo, ó el Turco...

Plans 'aft gang aglee,' and Madrigal is forced to resort to the footwear of Villadiego:

Porque no hay que esperar á los diez años
De aquella elefantil cátedra mía.
Mas vale que los ruegos de los buenos
El salto de la mata[1].

The well-known story of *The glove and the lion* (XIV) occurs in Mira de Mescua's *Galán valiente y discreto* (ed. Rivad., p. 36 c):

En Castilla sucedió
Que una dama arrojó un guante,
En presencia de su amante,
A unos leones; entró
El galán, y le sacó,
Y luego, á su dama infiel
Le dió en el rostro con él,...

[1] For parallels and bibliography see the present writer's study on Sebastian Mey's *Fabulario*, in *Modern Language Notes*, 1906, p. 201. The Sieur d'Ouville's version in *L'Élite des contes de...* (ed. Ristelhuber), No. XXXIX, is very similar.

This story, so briefly rounded off by Mira, forms the plot of Lope's *El guante de Doña Blanca*, and suggested the opening scenes of Miguel Sánchez's *La isla Bárbara*[1].

In Lope's *El Castigo sin venganza* (Act II) is told the story (XV) of Antiochus and Seleuchus. Lope's version has a twofold interest; in the first place, it is interrupted by dialogue, and secondly, it has a parallel in the main plot of the play itself. Lope, moreover, used it as the plot of another play, *La gran columna fogosa*[2].

Lope tells the following story (XVI) of Dante, not found in Papanti's *Dante secondo la tradizione e i novellatori*:

Cuál era de todo el mundo
El mas discreto, quería
Saber un rey, y aquel día
Dante, en las letras profundo,
Le dijo que el más discreto
Fué Demócrito, aquel sabio,
Sin hacer á nadie agravio,
Más prudente y mas perfeto;
Y era porque re reía
De todo cuanto pasaba;
Que si Heráclito lloraba,
Fué necia filosofía.
Ciento y veinte años vivió
Demócrito con su risa;
El llorón se dió más prisa;
Que á sesenta no llegó.

(*Quien ama no haga fieros*, ed. Rivad., p. 451.)

The part of this anecdote which is concerned with Democritus and Heraclitus, was popularised by Valerius Maximus[3]. Lope's version differs slightly.

The well-known story of *El huevo de Juanelo*, told also of Columbus, is thus referred to by Calderón (XVII):

Lo del huevo de Juanelo,
Que los ingénios más grandes
Trabajaron en hacer
Que en un bufete de jaspe
Se tuviese en pié, y Juanelo
Con solo llegar y darle
Un golpecito, le tuvo.

[1] The anecdote has been made familiar by Brantôme, Garci Sánchez de Badajoz, Bandello, Schiller, Leigh Hunt, Browning, etc. See Liebrecht, in *Germania*, VII, pp. 419 ff.; Menéndez y Pelayo, Lope, ed. Acad., IX, pp. lxxxv ff.; Puymaigre, in *Revue Hispanique*, 1895, pp. 166 f.; Chauvin, *Bibliographie des Ouvrages arabes*, VIII, p. 146.

[2] Ed. Acad., p. 206. Lope's source would be Bandello, II, lv, and he, in turn, refers to Petrarch's *Trionfo d'Amore*. See Dunlop, *History of Fiction*, ed. 1906, II, p. 72, for ultimate sources and parallels. The motive was used by Torres Naharro in *La Aquilana* and in several English plays.

[3] Other references will be found in Cristoval Suárez de Figueroa's *Plaza universal...* (1615), VII, p. 33.

Las grandes dificultades,
Hasta saberse lo son;
Que, sabido, todo es facil.
(*La dama duende*, II.)

Lope, in *Santiago el verde* (ed. Rivad., p. 198), narrates a familiar story of the Emperor Frederic (XVIII). This monarch, before besieging a certain city, gave permission to the women to carry out whatever they could bear on their backs, whereupon they carried out their husbands[1].

A legislator (XIX) decreed that, as a punishment for adultery, the eyes should be taken out. When his son was found guilty of this offence, the legislator took out one of his son's eyes and one of his own. Lope, *El amigo hasta la muerte* (ed. Rivad., IV, p. 884)[2].

MILTON A. BUCHANAN.

TORONTO.

[1] Mexia, in the *Historia Imperial...*, fo. ccxlvii, vo., ed. 1564, the usual source in Spain for such lore, tells the anecdote of Conrad III.

[2] Lope refers to this story in *El marqués de Mantua*, ed. Acad., XIII, p. 305. The first Spanish version is probably that of the *Libro de Castigos é documentos*, ed. Rivad., p. 105; the source, Valerius Maximus, is given. Moreto developed the theme into a play, *La fuerza de la ley*.

(*To be continued.*)

ON THE TEXT OF THE PROSE PORTION OF THE 'PARIS PSALTER.'

The Old English Prose Version of the first fifty Psalms, which is preserved in the so-called *Paris Psalter* (Bibliothèque nationale, Fonds latin 8824), has not received the attention it deserves. Until lately, it has been accessible only in Thorpe's *Libri Psalmorum*, etc. (Oxford, 1835), long since out of print. And this edition falls so far short of modern requirements of exactness, as to be of small value until corrected laboriously with the aid of Tanger's collation (*Anglia*, VI, Anzeiger).

About three years ago therefore, I undertook the preparation of a new and critical text, together with a detailed grammatical analysis. As far back as Easter, 1907, I carefully examined and re-collated the Paris Codex; but I was unable to have the whole of my work ready for the press until the beginning of last year. In the meantime, there has appeared a new edition of the Prose Psalms under the auspices of Professor J. W. Bright, of Johns Hopkins University. As the publication of my own work, which, I ought to mention, was announced in *Englische Studien* (XXXVII, 176) in the autumn of 1906, has thus been stopped, it may perhaps not be out of place to record here a few notes and emendations which are the result of actual study of the MS. and its linguistic forms.

Let us first consider a few readings which stand out in contrast to the general usage of the Codex and are obviously the work of a late scribe or scribes. Owing to the impossibility of comparison with other MSS., one is, of course, unable to sift out such late readings with certainty in every case; but at any rate some attempt to do so ought to be made.

33^{2} MS., Th(orpe), Br(ight), *herod*. Read *hered*. Our text keeps the I and II Conjugations absolutely distinct, the only exceptions being *gremiað* 5^{11}, which indeed is found in early WS., and *gegyrion* 34^{24}.

34^{24} MS. Th. Br. *gegyrion*, an extremely late form. Read *gegyrwen*. In all other examples of *gierwan* and *smierwan* in our text, the old regular forms are preserved; viz., *gegyred* 44^{11}, *gesmyredest* 22^{7}, *gesmy-*

rede 2[2] 44[9]. It is possible that the ending *-ion* is due merely to careless copying; for the same three letters occur immediately above the word, in the expression (*beslepen h*)*i on* (*hy*) of the line before.

26[2] 48[18] *afærd, forwyrnd.* Read *afær*[*e*]*d, forwyrn*[*e*]*d.* Except in the case of verbs in *d, t,* these are the only examples of syncopated past participles in the text; whereas there are 49 examples of *-ed,* among which the form *afæred* actually occurs (26[4]). Aelfric, too, has only *forwyrned, afæred.* The two short forms then, are certainly due to a late scribe.

23[1] *gefylð* must also be corrected to *gefylled,* not with Th. and Br. to *gefyld.*

15[1] 16[12] 30[2] 40[10] *gehealde, gehwyrfe, efste, arære.* These forms of the Imperative stand alone. On the other hand we have of the strong long stems, of the strong short stems, and of the weak long stems, 48, 13 and 61 examples respectively without the final *e,* among which occur *gehwyrf* twice and *geheald* four times. It is to be noted, however, that a form *lære* occurs once in the Hatton MS. of the *Cura Pastoralis.* Perhaps, then, the four Imperatives in *-e* are to be retained in the text.

hig 2[4], 9[19], 10[7], 17[14, 18, 32] etc. This spelling is of comparatively rare occurrence. Any editor who, as Bright does, regularly alters *mani* to *manig,* should for the sake of consistency remove also this late WS. converse spelling of *-ig* for *ī.*

2[9] MS. and editors *wylst.* Read *wyl*[*d*]*st* and note the retention of the *d* in all similar stems in our text, e.g. *gescyldst, gehyldst,* etc.

5[5] *speca*ð. Perhaps read *sp*[*r*]*eca*ð. This *r* is dropped sporadically, it is true, even in early WS.; but there are 32 examples of *spr-* in our text.

8[6] MS. Th. Br. *gesetest.* Read *geset*[*t*]*est.* If a Present had been intended here, the form would probably have been *gesetst,* as in 44[17]; for uncontracted forms are extremely rare. (The ratio of uncontracted forms to contracted is: weak, 14 : 109; strong, 6 : 170.) But we have to do here with a Preterite, 'constituisti.' Cf. *gesettes* VespPs. CantPs., *gesettest* RegPs.

In all the above cases, conservative editing, I admit, might reasonably leave the text untouched and relegate emendations to the foot-notes. I pass on to MS. readings which are too obviously faulty to be left as they stand. It will be noticed that, of the large number of such faulty readings, which were either emended unsatisfactorily or passed over

altogether by Thorpe, the majority have been reproduced by Bright with great faithfulness: in the few cases in which the American scholar ventures on an independent reading, he would have done better to trust to his predecessor.

9[6] MS. *heora þu towurpe*, Th. 'vox ceastra deest,' therefore Br. *heora ceastra*, etc. The right word to supply is *byrig*; cf. 30[24] 45[4] 47[1, 2, 7].

10[1] MS. *lære me*, overlooked by Th., also by Br. Supply *ge*.

17[11] MS. *betwu* with mark of abbreviation over the *u*. Br., following Th. again, resolves into *betwux*. Read *betwuh* and cf. 16[2].

17[43] MS. *oftlugon, t* above the line and in another handwriting. Th. (text) *oflugon*; Th. (notes), Br. *oft lugon*. Though I have been unable to discover any other example, I should prefer, with Wülfing, to keep the word as first written. Cf. the verbs with the prefix *of-*, in Bosworth-Toller's *AS. Dictionary*, in Wülfing's *Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen* (§ 109), and in Napier's *Contributions to Old English Lexicography* (*Trans. Phil. Soc.*, 1906).

18[6] MS. Th. *þe ne gyre mistlica godes gesceafta*; Br. *gyrre*. We have no evidence that **gyrran* was ever used transitively. In the second place, the meaning 'garrire,' 'sonare,' makes no sense here. In the third place, the corresponding Latin passage, 'quorum non audientur voces eorum,' shews what has happened to the text—the copyist has simply omitted two letters. Read *g[eh]yre*.

20[4] MS. *he þe bæd*. The correct reading is noted by Tanger. Th. by an oversight has omitted *þe*, and Br. again reprints him faithfully.

21[15] MS. Th. Br. *gerimde*. There is certainly a scribal mistake here. Supply *synt*, or read *gerimdon*.

23[3] MS. Th. *Hwa is þæs wyrðe þæt astige*. Br. supplies *he* before *astige*, probably unnecessarily.

23[9] MS. *eowge ecan geatu*. Br. of course reads *eowre* with Th. The right emendation is either *eowru* or *eower*.

27[1] MS. Br. *hopige*. This is clearly a mistake of the scribe's; read then, with Th., *cleopige*, 'clamabo,' and cf. VespPs., CantPs., RegPs.

29[11] MS. *wlite hrægl*. Th., copied again by Br., reads *hwite hrægl*. This does indeed appear a second time in our text (34[13]). I hold, however, both passages to be corrupt and prefer to read *witehrægl*. Cf. a similar expression in the metrical part of the *Paris Psalter* (68[11]):

Gif ic mine gewæde on witehrægl
Cyme cyrde.

Cf. also the compounds *witehus, witesteng*, etc.

29[11] MS. Br. *bebyrgdst*, Th. *gebyrgdest*. Read *begyrdest* and cf. 17[37].

31[3] MS. *mægen*. Th. *mægn*, overlooked by Tanger. Br. also *mægn*.

34[9] MS. Th. *gefo hi*; Br. *gefon hi*. A mere slip of the copyist's probably. Or could he have been influenced by the contracted forms of the verb used before *ge* and *we*?

34[13] MS. Br. *þe ic hi to sende*. Read *him* with Th. The scribe has simply forgotten to put in the required stroke over the *i*.

34[14] MS. Br. *þeahþeah hi*; Th. *þeah hi*. Read *þeah þe hi*.

35[arg.] MS. *Judas him dydon*; Br. *dyde*. Read with Th. *Jud[e]as*.

37[20] MS. Th. Br. *tælað*. Correct of course to *lætað* and cf. 43[18].

38[15] MS. Br. *nifara*. Th.'s reading *ni[d]fara* seems preferable.

39[15] MS. *þu gearige*; Th. (notes), Br. *þu me gearige*. Th. reads correctly in his text *þu me arige*. Cf. 39[21].

39[16] MS. *afyrranne*; Br. *afyrrane*, a printer's error.

41[3] MS. Th. *ic gehyrde mine secgan*. Br. alters *mine* into *to me*. Th. (notes) 'post *mine* nom. subst. deesse videtur.' I should prefer to regard this as an example of the absolute use of the relat. pron. Very similar examples are recorded by Wülfing (*Die Syntax in den Werken Alfreds des Grossen*, § 252). Cf. the phrase 'me and mine.'

41[4] Br., copying Th. without reflexion, supplies *ic* after *gemunde*, quite unnecessarily.

41[8] MS. *hefug*; Th. Br. *-ig*. Emendation is needed probably; for we have, as far as I know, no other records of *hefug*. Cf. however *hefogoston* in the *Blickling Homilies* (E.E.T.S., p. 75), and Streitberg, *Urgerm. Grammatik*, § 96.

41[11] MS. Th. Br. *mysceað*. Read *hysceað*.

42[3] MS. *þa þe*; Br. *þa þe me*. Th. reads rightly *þa me*. It is probable that *þa* alone could be used as a relative (cf. Wülfing, *loc. cit.*, § 274); but there is no room here for a relative, for the Latin text is 'ipsa me deduxerunt.'

44[18] MS. *cneorisse*. Th. alters needlessly into *-nesse*, and Br. shews again his faith in him. Since the year 1888, editors of Old English texts have had no excuse for not knowing that the termination *-nisse* was already in use in early WS.

45[2] MS. Br. *eall eorðe*. More probable is Th.'s emendation, *ealle*.

45[3] MS. *swa þęr muntas*, Th. *þær*; Br. *þa*. The MS. reading makes good sense.

48[6] MS. Th. Br. *wuldrað*. This is clearly a mistake of the copyist's, and was caused most likely by the occurrence of the letters *-að* in the

word *gylpað* immediately before. Our text contains no example of the late WS. plural termination *-að*; whereas *-iað* occurs 75 times.

49[11] MS. Th. Br. *ceap*. Taking into consideration the translator's addition of the words *ealra duna*, I should like to emend to *sceap*.

With reference to the division of the Psalter into verses, there are two reasonable courses open to an editor. Either he can closely follow the MS. in this matter—thanks to the initialer this is an easy task in the case of the *Paris Psalter*; or, to facilitate reference, he can choose the division of a standard version, such as the Vulgatê. Thorpe has chosen the former course, but does not always follow it consistently: Bright has in the following cases simply reprinted the inaccuracies of Thorpe's text.

17[37] begins at *Ac feollon*, as Tanger has already noted. The *þ* in *þu me begyrdest* is no initial.

24[7, 8]. There is great confusion here. *For þone...rihtwis* has been misplaced in the Codex immediately after the verse *Forþam...wegas*. Tanger's note does not show clearly that *For þone...rihtwis* forms a separate verse (7). Verse 8 is formed by *Forþam...wegas*, and a new verse (9) begins with *Ealle godes*.

12[4]. This verse, notwithstanding Tanger's note, is given correctly in Thorpe's edition: the concluding word is *deaðe*. But in place of Th.'s v. 5, there are two verses in the Codex: [þ]*y læs...þonne he* and [þ]*a þe me swencað...gelyfe*; the initials are lacking in both cases.

For the other passages in which Thorpe and his imitator have tacitly departed from the MS., reference may be made to Tanger's valuable article.

J. H. G. Grattan.

London.

SHAKSPERE'S PLAYS: AN EXAMINATION.

III[1].

Those who are inclined to make a 'root-and-branch' study of the plays that pass current under the name of Shakspere for the purpose of obtaining a thorough knowledge of his style will do well to avoid the common practice of beginning with the earliest ones and working onwards. To do so is to begin with plays that are in all probability not very largely the work of Shakspere, and in any case are not characteristic of him. One may adopt such a plan in connection with Scott or Thackeray, Byron or Shelley, because in the first place there is no doubt as to what are their early works, and because in the second place the whole or almost the whole of their first-period work was done alone. Concerning Shakspere's early efforts, on the contrary, all is doubt: some may be extant, unrecognised as his: some, included among his works, may be mainly the outcome of the labours of others. In any case it is tolerably certain that he began as a pupil and as an imitator; and therefore to begin with the plays of his first period is to run the risk of acquiring a false impression of his literary manner. It is better and wiser to start with plays that may reasonably be assumed to belong to the middle of his third period, and work thence onward to his plays of supposed latest date and then from the starting-point backwards to the commencement of his career. One may take as the middle of the great writer's third period the early part of the year 1601; and as the seventeenth century began, according to the reckoning of the day, in the month of March that month may be taken as giving the actual point of departure. If we adopt the chronology of one of the critics most highly endowed and most highly esteemed—Professor Dowden—we shall then read in the following order the plays which appear in the first folio:—*Julius Caesar, Hamlet, All's Well, Measure for Measure, Troilus, Othello,*

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. III (July 1908), p. 355.

Lear, Macbeth, Antony and Cleopatra, Coriolanus, Timon, Cymbeline, The Tempest, Winter's Tale, Henry VIII, Twelfth Night, As you like it, Much ado, The Merry Wives, The Taming of the Shrew, Henry V, Henry IV (2), *The Merchant of Venice, John, Richard II, Romeo and Juliet, Richard III, Henry VI* (parts 2 and 3), *Midsummer Night's Dream, Two Gentlemen, Comedy of Errors, Love's Labour's Lost, Henry VI* (part 1), *Titus Andronicus.* This order, working onward for the first 14 plays, and backward for the remaining 22, is as nearly that of a majority of the critics as any that is to be found, and it does as well as any other for a basis. It is accordingly in that order, omitting the four latest plays, which have been already discussed, that they are dealt with here.

The first six, as they appear in the folio (and no notice will be taken of other versions), are entirely the work of Shakspere. *Julius Caesar* is almost certainly of two dates, though but little of the early work is left. There is plenty of reason to believe that the play in some form was in existence in 1599, when Weever penned an allusion to it and Jonson ridiculed a line from it in his *Every Man out of his Humour.* The original play, of which traces are visible here and there, must have been of very early date; witness this passage (from v, 3):

> *Pin.* So I am free; yet would not so have been,
> Durst I have done my will. O Cassius!
> Far from this country Pindarus shall run,
> Where never Roman shall take note of him.
> *Mes.* It is but change, Titinius; for Octavius
> Is overthrown by noble Brutus' power,
> As Cassius' legions are by Antony.
> *Tit.* These tidings will well comfort Cassius.
> *Mes.* Where did you leave him?
> *Tit.* All disconsolate,
> With Pindarus, his bondman, on this hill.
> *Mes.* Is not that he that lies upon the ground?
> *Tit.* He lies not like the living. O my heart!

and so on for the remainder of the scene. The only argument used against an early date for the play is its absence from Meres' list of Shakespere's plays in 1598, but Meres' list does not pretend to be an exhaustive one, and if this play was as early and as stiff as the few passages still extant serve to indicate, it is little wonder that it was not mentioned among the round dozen he honours with notice. That it was greatly curtailed is shown by the frequency with which characters who are on the stage are allowed to remain mute. Note particularly that the Lepidus of III, 1 (who is not the Lepidus of

IV, 1) appears only once and does not speak, that in V, 3, Strabo, Volumnius, and Lucilius are all mute, while two non-characters, Labeo and Flavius, are addressed instead of the two former, and that Lucius is confounded with Lucilius.

That Shakspere's *Hamlet* was founded on an early work by Kyd is now generally admitted, but the folio version contains no fragments of the early play. Even where Kyd was most probably followed (as in the catalogue of woes in IV, 5) his verse was not retained. The language and the run of the verse show no signs of belonging to more than one period, but for all that it seems probable that it underwent some revision by the master even after he had made it entirely or practically his own. Thus, I, 1, the doings in which are related in I, 2, was probably the result of a revision, the mistake being made of retaining the subsequent scene describing what is there shown. In III, 2, again, we are confronted with the incredible circumstance of the king witnessing unmoved the dumb show rendering the acting of his crime. Is it not likely that in the old play the dumb show was sufficient to arouse the conscience of the royal criminal, and that the subsequent performance was an afterthought on the part of the dramatist? The quarto absolutely proves revision, but that text is beyond the scope of this paper.

All's Well contains numerous signs of alteration or condensation. In II, 1 Bertram and Parolles take no notice of the entry of the king, and probably the three speeches following were not in the original version; in II, 3 reference is made to Lafeu's son, the reference being understandable only on the assumption that he was a character in the play as at first written; in the same scenes the third lord's speech has dropped out; Violenta, one of the dramatis personae, never speaks, and appears only in one scene (III, 5), where Helena's 'Please it this matron' infers that Mariana was the only person present besides herself, Diana, and the widow; the steward is named only in the text (in III, 4); Morgan is also named only in the text (in IV, 3); the clown is not named till V, 2, and then only in the text; much confusion is caused by the failure to name (except in the text in one scene) the two Dumains, who are styled in the stage-directions throughout III, 6, IV, 1, and IV, 3 merely '1st Lord' and '2nd Lord' and are probably identical with the first and second lords of II, 1 and III, 1, and perhaps with those of I, 2, but are not among the lords in II, 3; in V, 3 the king says to Diana 'You said you saw one here in court could witness it,' though the play as it exists gives us no speech of Diana's to such effect; and, finally, Parolles' moralising at the end of IV, 3 implies that an end has been

made of him, whereas he appears again (twice) in Act v. On grounds of style the same conclusion of play-revision must be arrived at, early work being I, 3, that part of II, 1 beginning with the king's fourth speech after Lafeu's second exit, part of II, 3, the sonnet in III, 4, and III, 5. Though in the latter portion of II, 3 the rhyme is more jerky and central-paused than is usual in Shakspere, though III, 7 is unusually free from double endings, and though the run of the verse in portion of II, 1 and the beginning of V, 3 differs somewhat from that elsewhere, there need be no doubt that the play is entirely Shakspere's; but the epilogue is of doubtful authorship.

Measure for Measure shows no clear sign of being of more than one date, though the concluding of one scene with a 4-foot verse passage is strange in a Shaksperian play dating apparently from the year 1604. It may be noted that one character, Varrius, never speaks, that Juliet is mute in two of her three scenes, Barnardine in one of his two, and Claudio in the concluding scene. It may therefore be surmised that it has been cut down for stage purposes.

The concluding portion of *Troilus* has been declared to be largely non-Shaksperian, and it is quite likely that the final scene is a late addition to the rest of the play, (which would account for the inconsistency of making Aeneas the leader of the Trojan forces, though he has been declared in V, 6 to have been captured by the Greeks), and even that the drama originally ended with V, 3, as is rendered probable by the fact that the folio concludes that scene with the three closing lines of the play; but the style of the verse throughout speaks distinctly in favour of Shakespere's sole authorship, though the prologue is not his. It should, however, be obvious that the play is of more than one date, the Cressid portion of IV, 5 being in quite the manner of *Love's Labour's Lost.* There are frequently mute characters on the stage and Antenor, who appears in three scenes, never once opens his mouth. That in its first form the play dates from no later than the very early part of Shakspere's second period is shown not only by the style of such of it as is left, but also by the references in Willobie's *Avisa* (1594). The mention in V, 2 of *Much Ado* of the name of Troilus as having been already used in blank verse affords perhaps further proof of an early date.

Is it not possible that the unfinished character of this play, at the close of which Troilus and Cressida seem to be altogether forgotten, may be due to an intention on the part of the poet to pen a sequel? The line in the epilogue, 'Some two months hence my will shall here be

made' infers as much. If ever written, this doubtless dealt with the revenge which in his penultimate speech Troilus promises to achieve. In conclusion, attention may be drawn to the inconsistency in the drawing of Ajax.

The only portions of *Othello* which arouse any feeling of doubt as to their authorship, are the third gentleman's speech in II, 1, and to question Shakspere's sole authorship on that score would be absurd, for the speeches mentioned are, if not manifestly his, at least possibly his. If, however, it is tolerably certain that the play is wholly his, so should it be certain that it is not entirely of one period. The patch of rhyme (18 lines) in I, 3 is likely to be of comparatively early date, and it is difficult to believe that the explanations addressed by the characters to the audience can have been penned at the late date at which the bulk of the play as it stands was written. Founded on an earlier play (also by Shakspere) it was written apparently in 1604, in which year it was given at Court, but as printed contains additions of much later date.

Of the plays as taken in the order adopted here, *Lear* is the first containing work which is not Shaksperian. As it appears in the folio (and indeed in the quarto version also, but to a less extent) it has apparently been shortened for acting purposes, but it has also had some matter inserted to add to the popularity of the play with those who liked comic relief to heavy tragedy. There are passages here that no one would suppose to be Shakspere's if they appeared out of 'Shakspere.' Such are the last speech in III, 2, the bulk of Edgar's third last speech in IV, 1 (from 'Poor Tom' to 'waiting-women'), parts of III, 4 (from Edgar's entry to 'Modo he's called, and Mahu'), parts of III, 6, while Gloster is off the stage, and parts of IV, 6, between Lear's entry and the gentleman's. It is worthy of note that the above-mentioned speech in III, 2 is found only in the folio, not in the quarto; that of the second passage named only the first dozen and a half words find a place in the folio; and that of the fourth about half appears in the quarto alone. Too much weight must not, however, be attached to this circumstance, since many of the passages omitted in the folio are unquestionably Shaksperian in style. In any case the great bulk of the play is undoubtedly his, the non-Shaksperian portions consisting only of the Fool's prophecy and some 'poor Tom' nonsense. The closing speech in III, 6 is either non-Shaksperian, or of early date. The latter conclusion seems preferable, in which case it is to be supposed that Shakspere went over the play twice. May it not be that in the course of the shortening a scene showing the arrival of Oswald and Kent at Cornwall's court has been

dropped out, the description of the scene being inserted in II, 4 to make up for the omission? Until this is given it is not clear what has led up to the events in II, 2. It may be added that Lear's chief speech in IV, 6 bears considerable resemblance to the style and tone of the *Revenger's Tragedy*.

Macbeth is, like *Lear*, not entirely the work of Shakspere, though again the insertions are neither numerous nor important. The Cambridge Editors give a formidable list of spurious passages but the only ones that there is reason to deprive Shakspere of are III, 5 and Hecate's speech and song in IV, 1. The writer of these may have been Middleton, but there is no real resemblance to his style, and they may merely be the work of one familiar with his play *The Witch*. Why Shakspere should be so generally denied the credit of the Porter's soliloquy in II, 3 is not clear. It is like his work, and the effectiveness of its introduction in its place should be evident. That the play has been curtailed is obvious and some importance may attach to the fact that the accentuation of Dunsinane in IV, 1 differs from that given it in Act V. Whether, as Mr Fleay supposes, portion of IV, 1 dates from 1593—4 is not clear.

Antony and Cleopatra, though of unusual length, may be judged by the number of times that characters are suffered to remain mute on the stage to have undergone some abbreviation. Its authorship is beyond question.

Coriolanus is practically entirely Shakspere's, the only passage clearly not his being the patch of twelve rhyming lines introduced into II, 3. In II, 1, III, 2, and V, 2 there seem to be traces at times of yet another writer; but Shakspere's hand is in all these, and there need be no doubt of his sole authorship of them. This play affords considerable evidence of the truth of Professor Thorndike's assertion that in his later years Shakspere came under the influence of the younger dramatist, John Fletcher.

Timon, the most unpleasing of all the later plays of Shakspere, is, beyond all reasonable doubt, only partly his. As to what parts are not his there may be much difference of opinion; and the responsibility for the non-Shaksperian portions has never been definitely settled. The tendency amongst the critics has been to deprive Shakspere of the discredit of the most unsatisfactory portions of the play, and to allot to another writer most of the cut-and-thrust of the conversation of Apemantus, though in this connection it is to be noted that a somewhat similar abusive railer appears in *Troilus and Cressida*, which stands alone with *Timon* as a Shaksperian representative of that indefinite

class of play to which the theatrical manager of to-day gives the distinctive name of 'drama.' Shakspere's share of the play is I, 1 (minus probably the portion between the entry of Apemantus and the sounding of the trumpets), II, 1, 2 (minus probably the Apemantus portions), III, 6, IV, 1, 2 (with the exception of the last 21 lines), 3 (to Flavius' entry), V, 2, 3, 5; and perhaps III, 4 and V, 1 also contain some of his work. The tone of III, 1 is that of the *Revenger's Tragedy*, but it is also that of portion of *Lear*.

How Shakspere came to be concerned with another author in the production of this play may be variously accounted for. It has been supposed by some to have been primarily the work of the other writer, fitted for the stage by Shakspere; while some have regarded it as a play of Shakspere's pieced out by the other. That it has been twice written, or else patched by one on the ground-work of another is evident. The failure of the poet and painter to enter in IV, 3 after Apemantus has announced their approach (their visit to Timon not occurring till the next act) is a good proof; and others are—the entry of Lucius, Lucullus, and Sempronius in I, 2, whereas the conversation (evidently theirs) is carried on by 1st, 2nd, and 3rd lords; the substitution of three unnamed lords for these three in III, 6; the dropping of Ventidius after Act I, though in III, 3 he is spoken of as having been tried, and though in Act I Shakspere has plainly shown an intention to make a feature of his gross ingratitude; and the vagueness of III, 5, which does not tell us whom Alcibiades is defending (anyone reading the scene alone would naturally suppose that it was a character in the play who was referred to). There is much confusion also as to the servants of Timon, and probably the Servilius of II, 2, III, 2, and III, 5, is identical with the Lucilius of I, 1, the original author's name for the character having been misread by the reviser of the play. Otherwise it is difficult to see why the named servant Lucilius should be dropped, and so many unnamed ones take his place. In II, 1 and II, 2 Caphis is used as a creditor's servant: in III, 4 three other named and three unnamed servants of creditors appear. Of these three unnamed ones, one is a servant of Lucius, and two are servants of Varro. One of the latter appears again in II, 2, where is also an unnamed servant of Isidore. Neither Varro nor Isidore is a character, the only creditor who appears being a senator, the master of Caphis, who enters in II, 1, and whom his servant is, in II, 2, unable to name. The death of Timon too is singular, taking place off the stage, and the information given in regard to it being sudden and unexpected.

Twelfth Night is wholly the work of Shakspere, but is clearly of more than one date. The last eighteen lines of III, 1 and portions of V, 1 (particularly the sixteen verses beginning 'I'll sacrifice the lamb') are fragments of the earlier version, and there are many signs of alteration—notably the confusion as to the title of Orsino, and the two allusions to a difficulty between Malvolio and the unnamed sea-captain, leading to the latter's incarceration. That it was performed privately in February 1601—2 is known, and there is a certain allusion in III, 2 to a map published in 1599. It is possible also that this scene contains a reference to Coke's baiting of Ralegh at the latter's trial in November 1603. If so, this must have been an insertion after the first production of the revised version of the play, for the manner of the earliest portions is obviously of very much earlier date than 1599. How early they may be cannot be said with any certainty, but it is to be noted that III, 1 contains what seems to be a very clear reference to Tarleton, whose house was the Tabor next to St Benet's Church, in Gracious Street. The famous clown died in 1588, a date which most of the critics will deem far too early for even the first draft of this splendid fruit of Shakspere's genius; but probability is lent to the belief that in its first form it dates back to the time of Tarleton by, firstly, the Clown's reference to the transmigration of souls, the Pythagorean theory having been revived by Bruno on his visit to England, 1583—5; secondly, the similarity of the usage of Viola by the Duke to Julia's employment by Proteus on his love-errands (*Two Gentlemen*); and, thirdly, the resemblance of the scheme of the play, with the wonderful likeness of Viola and Sebastian, to that of the *Comedy of Errors*, with the twinness of the Antipholi. *Comedy of Errors* dates certainly no later than 1593—4, and may date much earlier, and there is good reason to group it and the first version of *Twelfth Night* amongst Shakspere's very earliest productions.

As You Like It is also entirely Shakespere's. It has undergone some revision, as shown by an allusion in IV, 1 to the act of 1605 'to restrain the abuses of players' and by a certain amount of confusion between the characters. It is a marriage play, scamped or altered towards the finish.

Much Ado also is of single authorship, but of more than one period. There are many signs of alteration and abbreviation. In I, 1 Claudio's uncle is spoken of as if he were to be a character, but he is never introduced; in the next scene Antonio's son is similarly mentioned as if he were a character, but he too never appears; in II, 3 Claudio

speaks of Beatrice as Leonato's daughter; and the George Seacoal of III, 3 becomes Francis Seacoal in III, 5. The play certainly dates prior to August 1600, when it was entered in the Stationers' Register for publication. Some critics assert that it was not in existence when Meres' work was published, because it is not mentioned therein, and others argue that it must be identical with the play that Meres calls *Love's Labour's Won.* Thus the one set dates it between 1598 and 1600, and the other not later than 1597—8. It is in favour of the latter view that *Love's Labour's Won* must have been a companion play to *Love's Labour's Lost*, and that *Much Ado* approaches more nearly to the scheme of that play than any other Shaksperian drama, but it is against it that the title of *Love's Labour's Won* would not be particularly appropriate. *The Tempest* and the *Taming of the Shrew* have both been suggested as identical with *Love's Labour's Won*, *As You Like It* has been hinted at, and *Twelfth Night*, the claims of which do not seem to have been advocated, is likelier than any of them; but the majority of the critics have pinned their faith to *All's Well.* However that may be, it is difficult to conceive of Shakspere's adopting as the hero of a play at so late a date as 1598 so unattractive a person as Claudio, one capable of behaving with the callousness that he exhibits after Hero's supposed death. The mature Shakspere would scarcely have allowed one whom he wished his audience to respect to treat so lightly a death for which he was in a sense responsible and to outrage the feelings of the public by intimating that he looked forward with greater pleasure to the winning of his second bride than he had done to his union with the one he had lost. The contrast between the earlier and the later styles may be seen by a comparison of III, 1 or portion of V, 4 with the bulk of IV, 1 or V, 1. The latter should certainly not date later than 1598, while the former is ascribable to 1592 or thereabouts. That this is likely is shown by the fact that one of Julius' 'Plays derived from English Sources' (1594) has the same plot.

Of *The Merry Wives* there is but one scene—IV, 1—the authorship of which is doubtful; but there is much reason to regard the play as of more than one date, and there are many matters in connection with it of which no satisfactory explanation can be given. The character of the joke played on the Host by Caius and Evans is very indistinct, due probably to curtailment. Mrs Quickly is certainly not the Dame Quickly of Henry IV and Henry V; and Shallow, though deliberately connected with the Shallow of 2 Henry IV, does not seem the same. In II, 3 the Host addresses Shallow as 'Master Guest,' though otherwise

there is nothing to show that he was staying at the Garter. Of the quarrel between him and Falstaff which is the main subject of the opening scene nothing is heard afterwards. Part of IV 4 seems to be of early date, and perhaps the best way of accounting for the above-mentioned facts is by supposing that Shakspere, given scant notice (so says the tradition; and indeed the construction of the play shows many signs of haste) to provide a comedy showing Falstaff in love, utilised for the purpose the ground-work of an old play of his own, boldly renamed some of the characters with the names of persons in the *Henry IV* plays, and was not very careful to fit them to their requirements. It is also in accordance with this scheme that Fenton is (in III, 2) made a former companion of Prince Hal and Poins. (It is noteworthy that the text of the original quarto states nothing of the sort, and also that it gives no hint of the identity of Shallow with Sir Thomas Lucy.) The play contains an allusion suggesting a date not much later than 1592, and it may be the *Jealous Comedy* acted by Lord Strange's men at the Rose in January 1592—3. The likeliest view is that it was rewritten into the form which is supposed to be, but is indeed very imperfectly, represented in the quarto of 1602 (which contains work not Shakspere's), and that the play underwent still further revision subsequently, for the folio version contains allusions to events of 1603 and 1605. It may be added too that there is, as has been pointed out by Mr Fleay, an extraordinary resemblance between the Host of this play and the Host of the *Merry Devil*. It must be supposed that this is due to imitation, for it is hard to see Drayton's hand in the *Merry Wives* or Shakspere's in the *Merry Devil*, although there are other curious circumstances connecting the two plays. It may perhaps be worthy of note that in IV, 3 and IV, 6 of the *Merry Wives* the Host does not speak in quite the same vein as elsewhere.

E. H. C. OLIPHANT.

LONDON.

(To be concluded.)

ZWEI ALTFRANZÖSISCHE MARIENGEBETE.

II.

Ce sont les xv joes nostre dame sainte Marie.

fol. 176 r. I Douce dame tresglorïeusse,
Mere de Deu, leaus espouse,
Marïe mere tresmillee,
Amïe coraument amee
De celui qui cet bien amer,
Tresluissant estoille de mer,
Par cui nos tuit avons lumiere:
Voirement la joie premiere
Que tu hëus do dous Jhesu,
Le tuen trescoral fil ce fui,
Quant Gabrïel o grant clartei
De par lo roi de majestei
fol. 176 v. Te dit lo salut amerous,
Le beau, le dous, lo saverous
Et dit que do saint Esperit
Conceveroiez sans respit
Et anfanteroiez sans poinne,
Vierge pure de grace ploinne,
Lo savaor de tot le monde.
Tresdouce, an cui toz biens habonde,

Var. 1 T. doulce d. gloriouse. 2 Meire D. serour. 3 meire t. honoree. 4 couraiousement aim. 5 b. sceit ameir. 6 luisans meir. 7 Per c. trestuit. 8 Donneis moi la j. p. 9 eus dou doulz. 10 Que li tiens courtoiz filz fut. 11 ot. 12 De part lou roy de majesteit. 13 dist lou salus amerouz. 14 Lou biaulz lou doulz lou saverouz. 15 dist dou. 16 Conceverois s. nulz r. 17 E. se l'anfanteroies. 18 Sens corrompre de neirs ne voinne. 19 Lou salveour de tout lou m. 20 Tresdoulce en c. touz b. habunde.

Par la joie qu'adont hëus,
Que tant humblement recëus
Qu'aprés si treshaute novelle
Te vosis appeller ancelle,
Toi depri je, tresdebonaire,
Que tu adroice mon afaire
Et m'espurge do mal d'orguil
Dont trop sovent santir me suel.

II Vierge dame, pure pucelle,
Tresdouce dame, demoiselle,
fol. 177 r. Volontiers me deliteroie
An la toie seconde joie:
Quant santis de ton fil Jhesu
Que tu avoiez concëu
San nul charnel atochement,
Et que fui cil plenierement
Sentis en toi, roïne eslite,
La vertu dou saint Esperite,
Et que tez ventres virginaus,
Que tant estoit purs et lëaus,
Dou mervoilleus concentement
Centi le dous angrossement,
Et que tes cuers et t'arme ardoient
Dou feu d'amor et enflammoient.
Douce dame, en la remembransce
De la jöusse cognoissance
Que tu hëus de ton signor
An celle delitousse ardor
fol. 177 v. Te pri je, tresleauz Marie,
Que me garde do mal d'anvie.

III Damoiselle, tresdouce sainte,
Douce vierge, pucelle ençainte,

21 Pour l. j. qu'aidonc eus. 22 Ke. 23 Car a. sai haulte n. 24 T. volcis appelleir a. 25 Te requiers. 26 entendes ai m. 27 me gette dou maul d'orguel. 28 sovant sentir. 29 Doulce meire, p. p. 30 T. gentils d. et dam. 31 En. 32 Volent. 33 sentis d. t. filz. 34 l'avoies conceut. 35 Sens nulz charnelz atouchements. 36 si priveement. 37 royne eslute. 39 E. t. v. virgineaulz. 40 Qui loiaulz. 41 mervillouz concevement. 42 Sentit lou doulz engroxement. 43 Ke ton corps e. t'airme ardoit. 44 d'amour e. enflaimoit. 45 Doulce d. e. remanbrance. 46 joiouse cognissance. 47 ëus signour. 48 Per c. delitouse amour. 49 loiaul amie. 50 dou maul d'env. 51 doulce et s. 52 Doulce v. tres doulce dame.

La toie tierce joie fui,
Que tu hëus dou douz Jhesu,
Quant Helyzabeth visitas
Et humblement la saluas.
Celle resut le tien salu,
Plainne fui de tote vertu
Et li enfes qu'elle portoit;
Et quant sëus qu'elle savoit
Que tu la mere Deu estoiez
Et que tu le fil Deu portoiez
Et humblement, par grant honor,
T'apella mere son signor:
De la joie qu'adont hëus
A chanter ton cuer esmëus
fol. 178 r. Et si fëis chanson novelle,
Que l'on magnificat appelle;
Pour ce quë an l'avespremant
Do mont par ton anfantemant
Nos commansa a ajorner,
Le fait sainte Eglisse chanter
Chascun jor per electïon
A vespre per devotïon.
Or te pri je, dame jöusse,
Per ceste joie delitousse
Que tu de toute ire m'efface
Si qu'a Jhesu ton chier fil place.

IV Douce dame, flors coloree,
Tu soiez totjors honoree;
Fille ton pere, amie, suers,
La quarte joe perce cuer:
Ce fut quant mervoilleusement

53 fut. 54 Ke t. eus d. roy J. 55 El. visitais. 56 lai saluaiz. 57 Et elle lors de ton salut. 58 Emplit de tres sainte vertut. 60 scëus. 61 lumiere de D. estoies. 62 qu. lou filz de D. pourtoies. 63 H. et per g. amour. 64 T'apellait meire ton signour. 65 qu'adonc ëus. 66 De chanteir os t. c. esmeut. 68 Qu'ele m. 69 ceu dame a l'avesprement. 70 Dame a t. 71 Nous comansait a ajourneir. 72 Nous f. saincte esglise chanteir. 73 Chescun jour p. devocion. 74 vespres yceste chanson. 76 celle j. delitouse. 77 touz pechiés me gairde. 78 Que ai t. filz puisse plaire. 79 Dame d'onour, flour c. 80 soies touz jours. 81 F. deu meire a. suer. 82 fehlt. 83 Se f. q. mervillousement.

De toi nesqui virginalment,
fol. 178 v. Sans nulle poinne et sans pechié,
Li glorïous rois de pitié.
Douce dame, quel joie avoiez
Quant tu corporelment veoiez
Le biau, le douz, le desirrei,
Que IX moix avoiez pourtei
An ton trespur, precïous cors!
Antre tes brais et tes tressors,
Dont te pouoies aasier,
Sovent et tandrement baisier
Et acoler le dous anfant.
Par celle joie si tresgrant
Te pri je, dame, que m'aïde,
Delivre moi de tote accide,
C'est de toute male paresce
Et de toute vainne tristesse.

V Sainte roïne, simple ancelle,
Noble norrice, fors pucelle,
fol. 179 r. Ensoigne moi, dame, et amer
La quinte joie et a conter
Des pastors et de lor venue
Quant la clartei orent vëue
Et an l'ore de l'enfanter
Oïrent les anges chanter,
Qui anoncerent lïement
La joe de cel nassement;
Et as ensoignes quë il virent
Corrurent vëoir et si virent
Tot ansi com dit lor estoit;
Et tes cuers, dame, que fasoit?

84 Nasquit d. toy v. 85 Sens senz pechiés. 86 gloriouz pitiet. 87 Doulce d. queil j. avoies. 88 Q. corporeilment lou vëoies. 89 Lou belz, lou doulz, lo desireit. 90 mois avoies pourteit. 91 En t. t. doulz p. corps. 92 Dedens t. b. iert t. trezors. 93 pooies aaisier. 94 Soventes foiz et a baisier. 95 escolleir lou doulz enf. 96 Que c. 97 T. p. d. qu. tu m'ayde. 98 Et m. d. d. tout. 99 malle peresse. 100 malle t. 101 Haulte dame. 102 N. royne tres forte p. 103 Ensigne m. d. a ameir. 104 recordeir. 105 Dez pastours e. d. lour v. 106 lai clarteit. 107 a l'oure de l'anfanteir. 108 aingres chanteir. 109 Si lour nonc. lieement. 110 naiss. 111 des signes que il y v. 112 fehlt. 113 Tout ensi lour. 114 tez.

Il se delitoit an grans joiez
De ces chansons que tu oioies,
Tresjoïssoient le cuer:
Dame, si me fai geter fuer
L'ardor de male covoitisse
Par ceste joie qu'a aprisse,
fol. 179 v. Et si estin an moi le vice
De la grant puor d'avarice.

VI Sainte pucelle, estoile clere,
Riche dame, trespïe mere,
Tresdebonaire, or me desploie
L'encoisson de ta siste joie:
Ce fui, dame, quant li iii roi
Devotement et sans desroi
S'an vindrent devers oriant
Et per l'estoile soulement,
Qui per mirascle les menoit,
Vindrent en Bethlëem tot droit
Pour ton bel anfant aorer;
Et por l'anfant plus honorer,
De lor tressors, que orent overs,
Il offrirent iii dons divers
Per mout tresgrant senefïance,
Trespreciousse, sans dotanse.
fol. 180 r. En grant joie estoit tes corages,
Toz avoiez les avantages,
Miez savoiez, que ne fasoient,
Ceu que lor don senefïoient.
Grant joie avoiez de l'enor
Qu'a ton fil et a ton signor
Faisoient par lor bel present;

115 en grant joie. 116 Et ces chouses toutes nettoies. 117 Et embaitoies en ton cuer. 118 or f. de moy geteir fuers. 119 Ardour d. malle covoitise. 120 Per yc. j. que j'ai aprise. 121 esting en moy lou v. 122 tres g puour. 123 cleire. 124 meire. 125 debonnaire. 126 La chanson d. tai sexte. 127 fut troiz rois. 128 sens desrois. 129 Se mirent. 131 Que miraicle. 132 tout. 133 beil aoreir. 134 pour honoreir. 135 lour tresors qu'orent oveirt. 136 Si o. dyv. 137 Et a moult gr. 138 preciouse sens doubtence. 139 A g. j. fut couraiges. 140 Tous avoies l. avantaiges. 141 Mieuls saivoies qu'il ne fais. 142 lez dons. 143 avoies de l'onour. 144 Que a t. filz e. t. signour. 145 per honour p.

Et por lor dous aorement
Me garde trestote ma vie
Do vilain mal de glotenie.

VII Roisne de tresbone color,
Que sans pechié et sans dolor
Tëus an ta sainte gecine
Quarante jors, sainte roïsne:
Il n'avoit qu'aspurgier en toi,
Mais por bien acomplir la loi
A Tample ton anfant portas
Et a l'auter lou presentas.
fol. 180 v. Dame, quant tu l'ëus offert
A Symëon tot an apert,
Quant antre ces bras lo resut
Anunsa ceu qu'anoncier dut
Et s'escria hardïemant:
'Ciz est lumieré de la gent
Et gloire dou peuple Israel.'
Tresdouce, ceu t'estoit mout bel
Quant tu oïz qu'ansi parloit,
Et sainte Anne lo tesmonnoit;
Ceu te dona, vierge saintisme,
De ton fil la joie septisme.
Par iceste tresgrant liosse
Et par la toie grant largesse,
Vierge noite, vierge trespure,
Garde mon cuer de toute ordure
Et de toute deshonestei.
Dame, trop mavais ai estei;
Fai moi anvers ton fil tel plait
Que me pardoint ce qu'ai meffait.

146 pour lou biaulz aornement. 147 gairde trestoute. 148 Dou glout. 149 Rose d. t. bonne colour. 150 sens pechiet dolours. 151 Gëus en la s. gessine. 153 purgier e. toy. 154 Maiz pour b. espurgier l. loy. 155 Au temple t. enfant portaiz. 156 auteil presentaiz. 158 S. lou tint en a. 159 en ses brais lou receut. 160 Anunsait anuncier deut. 161 s'escriait moult haultement. 162 Cist e. li mirëurs des gens. 163 pueple. 164 doulce, yceu e. moult beil. 165 oys qu'anci. 166 lou tesmoignoit. 167 Se t. donnait dame saintime. 168 filz septime. 169 ycelle grande lyesse. 170 per grande proesse. 171 Virginitei v. 172 Gardeiz m. corps d. toutes ordures. 173 toutes deshonesteiz. 174 j'ai t. malvaise esteit. 175 envers filz mon p. 176 Qui m. perdoint touz mes meffaiz.

VIII Mere, mere, pucelle tanre,
fol. 181 r. Fai moi, tresdouce dame, entendre
De ton fil l'uitisme lioisse,
Ou avoiez si grant destresce,
Quant fuis en Egypte exillie
Por Herode et por sa mesnie,
Qui ne queroient fors la vie
De ton anfant par grant anvie.
Mais, dame, il te fui mout bel
Quant an la terre d'Israël
Retornas do païs estrange
Par l'amonestement de l'ange,
Qui nonça que cil mors estoit
Qui la mort de l'anfant queroit.
A recor de ceste grant joie
Ton confort, dame, a moi anvoie,
fol. 181 v. De toz mes pechiez me delivre
Et me fai si netement vivre
Que je puisse par bien ovrer,
Mon tresdous païs recovrer.

IX Sainte roïne coronee,
Belle de cors bien aornee,
La nosme joie fui mout grans,
Dame, quant tez fiz ot xii ans;
Il fui mou tresbez damoisés,
Otor ala li bons, li bez,
An Jherusalem a la feste.
Premiers i hëus grant moleste;
Par iii jors perdis ton anfant
Et aprés lo trovas ceant
Antre les mastres sagement,

177 Belle meire p. tenre. 178 doulce. 179 filz l'uitime lyesse. 180 Ou tu avoies gr. 181 fus. 182 Pour maignie. 183 Qu'il n. quar. 184 chier filz et per envie. 185 Maiz fut moult beil. 186 en Israhel. 187 Retournais dou payx estrainge. 188 Et per angre. 189 anunsait q. mors estoient. 190 queroient. 191 retourneir d. c. j. 192 nous envoie. 193 De nos anemis nous d. 194 se nous f. saintement v. 195 nous puissiens per b. ouvreir. 196 Nostre doulz paix recouvreir. 197 Haulte royne coronnee. 198 d. touz biens a. 199 Lai nuevime j. fut grant. 200 filz. 201 fut moult t. biaulz damoiselz. 202 Otoy aloit li boins li belz. 203 En lai. 204 en ëus. 205 Per treiz jours enf. 206 pues lou trouvais tu seant. 207 Entre l. maistres saigem.

Oioit les antantivement
Et si sustilmant opposoit
Que li puples s'an mervoilloit;
fol. 182 r. Dont si tresgrans et sage entente
Apparoit an telle jovente!
Grant joie hëus do retrover,
De l'escouter, dou ramener.
Tresdouce, par celle grant joie
Ramoinne moi a droite voie
Et si me fai, tresdebonaire,
Par san parler et par san taire.
Roïsne de virginitei,
Par celle grant humilitei
Que tez fiz si tresdoucement
S'an vint a ton commandement
Humblement me fai obëir
A quanque lui vient a plasir.

X Tresesmeree, treseslite,
La dessisme n'et pas petite,
Quant as noces Archetreclin
Fit tes dous fiz de l'eve vin
fol. 182 v. Par sa devine poestei,
Dont primes ot manifestei
A ses deciples de sa gloire.
Toi pri en la sainte mermoire
De cel bel miracle devin
Et de la plantei dou bon vin,
Dont furent tuit rasacié,
Qu'aiez de moi tresgrant pitié.
Dame, mes cors est si malades,
Plains de velin et frois et fades!

208 Qui tant bien et esseneement. 209 tant subtilment. 210 pueples s'en mervilloit. 211 Que si grant sens, si grant e. 212 Apparissoit en teil juvente. 213 ëus dou retourneir. 214 Et qu'avec toi vot aleir. 215 doulce per ycelle j. 216 Rameneiz moy. 217 Si nous faites. 218 Per sens parleir et per sens t. 219 Royne de virginiteit. 220 Per humiliteit. 221 filz doulcement. 222 Se mist en t. 223 nous f. obeyr. 224 Et lui en plaisir. 226 Lai dexime n'est p. petite. 227 archedeclin. 228 Fist tez doulz filz de l'yawe. 229 Per sai tres digne poesteit. 230 Tout premier ot manifesteit. 231 dissiples. 232 Tres doulce a la s. memoire. 233 belz miraicle. 234 lai planteit boin. 235 D. il f. trestuit hauciés. 236 Aies de nous t. g. pitiet. 237 nos cuers sont malaides. 238 froiz et frailes.

Dame, de mes maus me delivre
Et me fai si netement vivre
Totjors an droite charitei
Et me garde en bone santei.

XI Douce dame tressecoirauble,
Tresbenigne, tresamiauble,
Ques hons porroit a ce monter
Qu'il sëut dire ne conter
fol. 183 r. La grant plantei et la largesce
De la toie onzime liesce !
Il n'estoit se mervoille non,
Tant estoit bel siu cermon
Et tantes mervoilles fasoit:
Les paralitiques sanoit,
Li musel estoient mondei
Et li avugle ralumei;
Les contrais fasoit droit aler,
Les sors oïr, les mus parler,
Il sanoit toutes maladiez
Et as mors randoit il la vie
Et per lou sien commencement
Cessoient la mers et li vent.
Les cors plains dou saint Esperite
Randoit et sains et sauf et quite
Et .v. mil hommes repleni
De .v. pains qu'il lor departi;
fol. 183 v. Et tant autres miracles grans
Fasoit comme li rois poissans.
Bien te dëus, dame, esjoïr
De ceu vëoir et de l'oïr.
Per ceste joe si pleniere

239 Doulce de touz maulz d. 240 f. que nous soiens tuit yvres. 241 Dou vin de sainte chairiteit. 242 Qui nous gairt an droite santeit. 243 Tres courtoise, tres secourrauble. 245 Qui se poroit ai toy monteir. 246 Qui poïst panceir et conteir. 247 clarteit lairgesse. 248 joie et o. liesse. 249 n'i ot mervelle. 250 estoient belz ses sermons. 251 Que lez malaides garissoit. 252 Et tant de miraicles fasoit. 253 musiaus en e. mondeis. 254 aveugles enlumineis. 255 Lez aleir. 256 Lez xours oyr parleir. 257 garissoit t. malaidies. 258 az ren. lai. 259 p. son soul comandement. 260 lez. m. vens. 261 corps des malvais e. 262 Il les ren. et s. et quittes. 263 homes raemplit. 264 p. d'orge qu'il partit. 265 d'aultres miraicles grant. 266 Faisoit com li tres poïssant. 267 devies d. renjoir. 268 En son v. venir oyr. 269 plainniere.

Te pri je, douce dame chiere,
Que ton dous fil vers moi apaie
. . . . . .
Dame, je a tant a garir,
A monder et a esclarcir,
A restorer et redrecier,
A delivrer et appasier
Que je ne sa de moi que dire
Se mirascle n'i fait ci Sire.

XII Tresdouce de tresgrant honor
Et tresplainne de grant amor,
A bien orer ansoingne moi,
A panser et parler de toi,
A ta douzime joie dire:
fol. 184 r. Premiers hëus assez mertire,
Que oncques mere tant n'an sosfri,
Quant vëis que tez fiz sosfri
En soverainne pacïence
Et en merveilleusse ignoscence
Si delirousse passïon
Pour la notre redemptïon.
Trop fui tes cuers en grant destroit,
Tu savoiez que . . . . estoit,
Quë il lo t'avoit anuntié
Et comant il iert sans pechié
Concëus et nes et nosriz
Et ces biaus fais et ses biaus diz
Et la grant purtei de ta vie;
Et quant vëis que par anvie,
Sans achoison, a si grant tort,
Fui laidis et jugiez a mort
Et vilmant an croix clofichiez,

270 prions nous dame tres ch. 271 Ke t. doulz filz ver nous apaixes. 272 Qui nous garisse de nos plaies. 273 Tant ait en nous d. a g. 274 Et a mondeir et aiclairir. 275 restoreir et a redressier. 276 delivreir et a paier. 277 saix vous. 278 miraicle li sires. 279 T. digne honour. 280 Tres p. de tres g. doulsour. 281 Bonne a servir ensigne moy. 282 panceir parleir toy. 283 lai dous. 284 ëus tant de merite. 285 C'onq. femme t. n'en senti. 286 ton filz souffri. 287 souv. pat. 288 souverainne ignorance. 289 La dolerouse 290 nostre redempcion. 291 Tez cors fut a trop. 292 savoies quelz il e. 293 Et coment il t'av. nunciet. 294 Et que il estoit sens p. 295 neiz norris. 296 sez b. faiz et sez bialz d. 297 purteit sa. 298 per env. 299 Sens oquixon et. 300 Fut l. e. jugies. 301 vilainnement clofichiés.

fol. 184 v.

Dont fui tes dous cuers tresperciez,
Dont fui ta douce arme navree
De celle delirousse espee
Que Symeon t'avoit contee.
Mais autrement fui restoree
Quant li tresdous resuscita
Et quant ces amis visita
Et geta de celle occultei
Qu'il avoient tant estei.
Par celle joie mout disauble
Te pri je, dame delitauble,
Fai vers ton fil por moi prïere
Quë il me doint an tel meniere
La soie sainte passïon
Recorder par devotïon
Qu'a sa joie puisse venir
Et an lui vivrë et morir.

XIII

fol. 185 r.

Douce dame, sainte Marie,
Vierge pure, vierge florie,
Toute ma joie et m'esperance
Et m'avouee, car m'avance
Et si me met an droite voie
De dire ta tressime joie:
Ce fui quant li tres dous Jhesus
Se monta sor les ciez lassus,
Mout te plaisoit, dame, a vëoir,
Com verais Deus par son pooir.
Li apostre le convoioient
De lor iaux tant com il pooient.
Certes, dame, grant joie avoiez
Quant tu ton fil autel vëoiez
An si tresmervoilleusse gloire

302 Adonc fut tez c. tresperciés. 303 Donc fut tai doulce airme. 304 dolorouse. 305 nunciet. 306 Maiz haltement refut haulciés. 307 doulz resuscitait. 308 ses visitait. 309 getait obscurteit. 310 Ou esteit. 311 Per c. choze veritauble. 313 a t. filz pour nous proiere. 314 Qu'il nous d. en teil maniere. 316 Recourdeir per devocion. 317 Qu'en sa gloire puixiens v. 318 en. 319 Sainte et pure vierge M. 320 va'llant. 321 Nostre j. nostre e. 322 Nostre voie c. nous a. 323 nos m. en. 324 la trezime. 325 fut doulz. 326 Si montait el cielz. 327 Moult. 328 vrai deu et per. 329, 330 fehlen. 331 avoies. 332 tres doulz filz veoies. 333 En si t. mervillouse joie.

Et si tresjoousse vitoire
Monter si tresapertemant
Et si tressignorïement.
Sainte honoree, debonaire,
fol. 185 v. Sainte dame, que porra faire
Ce ci de moi ne te sevient?
A ceste joie te covient
Que tu tresefforcïement
Prïe ton fil omnipotent
Que il mon cuer traie apres lui,
Qu'an lui soient tuit mi refui,
Qu'an lui soient a totjors
Et mui delit et mes amors.

XIV Belle flors de virginitei,
Aornee d'umilitei,
Pors de salut, celle de miel,
Tamples d'amors, porte de ciel,
Mout fuis doucement embrassee
Et hautement enluminee
An ton quatorzeme delit
Quant santis dou saint Esperit,
Que tez dous fiz sor ces amis,
fol. 186 r. Si com il lor avoit promis,
Et langue de feu lor tramit.
Tresdouce mere Jhesucrist,
Langue de feu me fai avoir:
Li feus alume pour vëoir
Et li feus art por eschaufer
Et la langue est por parler.
Dame, se je par ta proiere
Avoie langue an tel meniere

334 a si joiouse vict. 335 Monteir. 337 S. Marie d. 338 vierge que poons nous f. 339 e de nous y ne te sov. 340 comant. 341 amerousement. 342 Jhesu o. 343 Qu'il nos cuers traicet envers. 344 nos refus. 345 Et en l. touz jours. 346 nos d. et noz confors. 347 flour de virginiteit. 348 umiliteit. 349 Porte de l'air porte du ciel. 350 Temple enmiellee de miel. 351 Moult fut doulcement embraisee. 352 hault. 353 A cest quators. 354 sentiz. 355 Quant tez doulz filz s. ses a. 356 lour a. permis. 357 En langue de f. lou. 358 doulce meire. 359 nous faiz. 360 Le feu a. tout p. 361 airt pour eschaufeir. 362 li l. parleir. 363 Doulce s. j. per tai. 364 L. a. de celle m.

Que veraiement m'allumat
Et par sa clartei me donast
Bien cognoistre ma petitesse
Et de lui la tresgrant largesce,
Et me fëist bien eschaufer
Jhesucrist et mon prome amer,
Et me fëist mes pechiez dire
Et Deu loer et moi despire:
Ainsi porroie je venir,
fol. 186 v. Ma douce dame, et avenir
A la toie quinzeme joie,
Dont volantiers me santiroie.

XV La quinzeme fut la darrene,
Sor toutes autres soverainne,
Quant de cest siegle dus passer.
De plusors leus fit asambler
Toz les apostres an celle hore
Deus li tiens peres sans demoure
Pour faire tot a sa droiture
Ton obseque et ta sepulture.
En Paradis fuz lors portee
Et davant ton fil presantee;
Do ciel te fit dame et roïne
Et toute riens a toi encline.
En l'enor de toutes cez joiez
Te pri je, dame, que tu m'oiez
Mes prïeres, mes orisons,
fol. 187 r. Et de toutes mes mesprisons
Me fai pardon et aquitanse
Par ta pitié, par ta poissanse,
Si que m'arme soit an la gloire
De Paradis par ton aitoire.
Amen an di, douce Marie,
A cui je rent m'arme et ma vie.

365 vr. enluminaist. 366 per s. clarteit m. donnaist. 367 De b. c. mai p. 368 de Deu haultesce. 369 pechies. 370, 371 fehlen. 372 loweir D. et moy d. 373 Enci poroie a Deu v. 374 doulce. 375 lai t. quinzime. 376 volent. me senteroie.

ANMERKUNGEN.

3 *millee.* Weitere Fälle von Reduktion des betonten und unbetonten *ie* zu *i* im Lothring. verzeichnen Bonnardot in Bouteiller's Ausg. der *Guerre de Metz* (Paris, 1875) S. 440 und Apfelstedt im *Lothringischen Psalter* (Heilbronn, 1881) S. XIX. P hat regelmässig *miellee.*

8 Es fehlt das Verbum des Hauptsatzes, das *fui* (v. 10) nicht sein kann; s. Anm. zu v. 13 des ersten Textes. P und O vermeiden die Anakoluthie.

19 *savaor*, von Godefroy angeführt nach dieser Stelle; vergl. *pugnaour* im *Orson de Beauvais*, v. 2862, und *pechaor* in *Li Regres Nostre Dame*, Str. 275, 1 (Var.) der Ausgabe von A. Långfors (Paris, 1907); s. dazu die Einleitung, S. XCVIII.

21 *Par* statt *pour*; desgl. v. 76, 96, 120, 169, 170, 215, 220, 269.

26, 50 *adroice, garde.* Über diesen Imperativ in einem mit *que* eingeleiteten Satze s. Tobler, *Verm. Beitr.*, I (2. Aufl.), S. 25 ff.

31, 32 in O umgestellt.

36 L. nach O : *Et que tu ci* (=si) *p.*; *que* ersetzt *quant*, sowie v. 39 und 43.

40 Hs. *prous*, darüber *purs*; Hs. Charleville: *surs et roiaus. Que*=qui.

41 Besser *concevement* mit O und Ch.

43 *corps* (cors) vorzuziehen mit O und Ch. *arme* aus anima (Diss.) altfr. Hss. sehr geläufig; s. Meyer-Lübke, *Gr.*, I, 445 und Körting, *Lat.-Roman. Wörterbuch*, 2. Aufl., Art. 659.

46, 75 *jousse* (dreisilbig); die richtige Schreibung ist *joousse* 334; vergl. *joe* 82, 110 und in der Überschrift (sonst stets zentralfr. *joie*), welche reduzierte Form sich noch häufig im *Orson de B.* findet: v. 364, 1928, 3390, 3412 und *joant* 'joyeux' v. 3377.

51 Ch hat *t. pieue s.*

52 *pucelleençainte* wurde vom Schreiber von O für anstössig befunden und dem Reime zum Trotz in *tres doulce dame* geändert.

57 Ch : *Et elle lués a ton salut.*

58 Ch : *Fu p. d. sainte vertut.*

72—74 Ch=O.

77, 78 Ch : *Q. t. d. t. oevre mauvaise Me delivre si que a Dieu plaise.* Wegen *que* mit dem Imp. s. Anm. 26.

92 Statt *et* lies *ert.*

97 S. Anm. 26.

98, 99 Die beiden Verse sind von Godefroy angeführt als Belegstelle für das Wort *accide* 'insouciance, indolence, paresse.' S. Körting, *Wörterbuch*, 112, *acedia*='mürrisches Wesen, üble Laune.'

103 *et* für *a* (praep.) über *ai(t)*, eine in volkstümlichen lothringischen Texten nicht selten anzutreffende Schreibung, die jedoch in unserer Handschrift befremdet, da diese nicht den mundartlichen Nachlaut *i* nach *a* sondern die entgegengesetzte Erscheinung, die Reduktion von *ai* zu *a*, begünstigt. Siehe darüber Bonnardot in seiner textkritischen Studie zu Bouteiller's Ausgabe der *Guerre de Metz*, S. 436 und Glossaire s. v. *et*, sowie Keuffer in *Romanische Forschungen*, VIII, S. 465.

111 Der Hiatus kann vermieden werden, wenn man mit O *qu'il y virent* liest.

117 Der Vers ist zu kurz; etwa: *Tresjoïssoient* (5 silbig) *tuit li cuer* oder *Qui tr.* (in aktivem Sinne) *le cuer.*

131, 233, 265, 278 *mirascle*, von Godefroy nach unserem Texte und einer Stelle aus Wace's *Conception* (Hs. Br. M. Add. 15606 fol. 55c) in sein Wörterbuch (Compl. s. v. miracle) aufgenommen, ist mit *sustilmant* 209, *sosfri* 285 und 286 (und Einfluss der Praep.) *nosriz* 295 umgekehrte Schreibung, da *s* vor Kons. längst verstummt war, wie die Reime *gecine* : *roïsne* (nach rois) 151, 152, *allumat* : *donast* 365, 366 und *tramit* : *Jhesucrist* 357, 358 zeigen; s. noch *et* (=est) 226.

132 Die Hs. hat *paradis*, gebessert in *bethleem*.

146 folgt in Hs. Douce das Verspaar : *Doulce meire dou roy de gloire, Per ycelle sainte memoire.*

148 Hs. *gloteriie.*

149 Bessere : *Rose* mit O.

153 *aspurgier*, lothr. für *espurgier.*

155 Hs. *anfans.*

159 *ces*=ses; ebenso 296, 308, 355. Vgl. *ceant* 206.

165 Hs. *ploroit*, gebessert in *parloit.*

169 Wegen *liosse* mit Reduction von *oi* zu *o* (vergl. *lioisse* 179) s. die Einleitung.

174 In der Fassung O war das Gebet für eine Dame bestimmt.

196 ist wohl nach O zu lesen: *Ma t. douce pais r.*

199 Die befremdliche und unsichere Kurzform *nosme* (der erste Schaft des *m* ist in der Hs. von den beiden folgenden getrennt) ist wohl von dem Schreiber aus metrischen Gründen gebildet worden (wegen *mout*). Es ist daher mit O zu lesen: *La neuvisme* (oder *nuev.*) *joie fui grant.* Vgl. noch die Analogieform *dessisme* (v. 226) für regelm. *disme.*

210 *puples* (*peuple* 163) *avugle* 254; über diese Schreibung, welche auch im *Lyoner Yzopet* (s. Einl., XXXIII) begegnet, s. zuletzt Långfors, *Li Regres Nostre Dame*, S. VII.

226 *dessisme*, Analogieform zu *septisme, uitisme.* Hs. *petitte.*

232 *mermoire* mit pleonastischem *r* (vor *m*) durch Assimilation wie *armors* in v. 163 des anglonorm. Textes.

246 *sëut*, Konjunktiv für *sëust.*

250 Statt *siu* lies *sui* (nach *mui* 346) und demgemäss *estoient* mit O; die beiden Pluralformen (Masc.) des unbetonten Possessivpronomens *mui, sui* finden sich z. B. im Lyoner *Yzopet*, s. Einl. S. XIX. Betreffs *tui* im Lothr., das unserem Texte fehlt, vgl. Meyer-Lübke, *Gramm.*, II, S. 114.

259 Bessere: *comandement.*

261 *saint*, Euphemismus? Besser mit O *ma(u)vais* zu lesen; dann ist *esperite* dreisilbig.

271 fehlt der Reimvers, der nach O gelautet haben mag: *Qui me garisse de ma plaie. Que* mit Imp., s. Anm. 26 und v. 342.

277 Für unmögliches *sap* der Handschrift habe ich die mundartliche Form *sa* in den Text gesetzt; vgl. *Orson de Beauvais*, v. 515: *Or ne sa se ma mere li feroiz esposer.*

285, 286 Identischer Reim, zu verbessern durch Aufnahme der Var. *senti* in den Text; l. auch *Qu'oncques.*

288 *ignocence* (wohl durch Einfluss von *ignorance*, s. Var.) begegnet noch im *Lyoner Yzopet* v. 110.

289, 304 *delirousse.* Letztere Stelle bei Godefroy s. v. *deliros* 'enragé, furieux,

effroyable.' Besser entspricht dem Sinne die Lesart der Oxforder Handschrift (*dolerouse*), dessen Schreiber das seltene Wort wohl unbekannt war.

292 Das Wort nach *que* ist unleserlich; die Ergänzung der Stelle ergiebt sich aus O.

295 Hs. *comceuz.*

314 Hs. *menire.*

327, 328 in O umgestellt.

332 Hs. *an tel.* Morel vermutet *an cel* (für *ciel*).

333 Hs. *ainsi*, in *an si* geändert, da *an* in der Hs. nie den Nachlaut zeigt.

339 *Ce* = se.

344 Hs. *am lui.*

357 Bessere: *En l.* nach O.

370 *prome*<*proximum*, auch im *Lothringischen Psalter* (S. XLIV).

NACHTRAG.

Schlussstrophe der Oxforder Handschrift[1].

fol. 185 r. Benoite et tresbien aornee,
Dame sor toutes aoree,
La toie siste (!) ascentïon
Ce fut la consummatïon
De toutes joies et la quinzime,
Quant de cest siecle, qu'est l'abisme—
Ceu est vallee, ceu est exil—
Ou[2] noblement, sens nulz perilz,
Fut tes corps et ton armé[3] levee
fol. 185 v. Come(nt) röyne (et) co|ronnee.
Sor touz les ordres de laissus
Est tes biaulz filz li doulz Jhesus,
Li tresdoulz souloiz de justice:
T'ait a la soie dextre mise
Et fait et fit tant de l'onour
Comme tes filz et ton signour;
Et fist a honoreir sa meire.

[1] Nach der von E. Stengel (*Mittheilungen aus franz. Handschriften der Turiner Universitätsbibliothek*, Halle, 1873) bekanntgegebenen Probe—die 2 ersten und 3 letzten Zeilen—enthielt diese Strophe auch die oben erwähnte, 1904 vernichtete Turiner Hs.

[2] Vielleicht *ou* zu streichen und *et* nach *noblement* einzusetzen. [3] Lies *t'arme.*

Dame aaisiee, dame cleire,
Dame de grant delices plainne,
fol. 186 r. Or yes assise a lai fontain|ne
De touz biens, de touz honours,
Plainnement sor lez biens d'amour.
Or cognoiz tu bien l'uniteit
De ceste sainte triniteit;
Tu es la maistre consilliere:
Or nous secour per tai proiere,
Comme fille deprie lou peire,
Ausi commande comme meire
Au saint Esperit com amie.
Or y perrait pouxa[n]t amie[1]
Com priereiz lou hault signour,
Si com il est flours de doulsour,
Fontainne de chariteit,
De courtoisie et de piteit,
Habundance grande et plainniere
De delices et de lumiere,
De joie, de gloire et de graice,
Que il en cest siecle nous faice
A lui servir si tresforment
fol. 187 r. Et saintement | et doulcement
Qu'en la fin lou puissiens vëoir
Tenir, embraissier et avoir.
Dites amen que Deus l'otroit.

J. Priebsch.

Wien.

[1] Identischer Reim. Die Stelle scheint verdorben, vergl. *poïssant* v. 266 (Var.).

'AHRIMANES.'

BY

THOMAS LOVE PEACOCK.

ALTHOUGH renewed interest has been taken recently in the works of Thomas Love Peacock, a large amount of literary matter from his pen still remains unnoticed and unpublished. Among these efforts, which include three plays, an *Essay on Fashionable Literature* and a considerable number of letters, perhaps the most remarkable is the unfinished poem *Ahrimanes*. It is contained in one of the two volumes (No. 36816) of Peacock's literary remains which are in the possession of the Trustees of the British Museum, having been purchased by them from Mrs Edith Clarke in 1903. Following it is a lengthy outline in prose for its completion which is reproduced, with some alterations, in a series of prose sketches divided into twelve cantos. Both the poem and the prose descriptions of the continuation are holographic, but it is difficult from the writing to say when they were written. The only allusion to it that the writer has been able to find is contained in Sir Henry Cole's *Biographical Notes* (p. 11), of which only ten copies were printed in 1875. Cole inaccurately states that the manuscript consists of a fragment of the first canto and attributes that to the date 1810, but it would be interesting to know upon what grounds he does so. A part of the subject-matter resembles somewhat the poem *Necessity* published in Cole's 1875 edition of Peacock's works (Vol. III, p. 105) which was written after 1811, while the birth of primogenial love given in Stanzas V. and XIX. recalls a note belonging to the first canto of *Rhododaphne* (Cole's edition of Peacock's works, Vol. III, p. 158) which was first published as late as 1818. Besides, the following poem shews the influence of Shelley, in spite of its pessimistic tone, and it was not until 1812 that Shelley and Peacock met and their friendship began. Moreover, it will be shewn later on

that it was the outcome of Peacock's intercourse with one of the many eccentric friends that Shelley gathered round him at Bracknell and with whom Peacock became first acquainted in the autumn of 1813.

Ahrimanes.

Man's happiest lot is not to be:
And when we tread life's thorny steep,
Most blest are they who earliest free,
Descend to death's eternal sleep.

Canto I.

In silver eddies glittering to the moon,
Araxes rolls his many-sounding tide.
Fair as the dreams of hope, and past as soon,
But in succession infinite supplied,
The rapid waters musically glide.
Now, where the cliffs' phantastic shadow laves,
Silent and dark, they roll their volumed pride:
Now, by embowering woods and solemn caves,
Around some jutting rock the struggling torrent raves.

II.

Darassah stands beside the lonely shore,
Intently gazing on the imaged beam
As one whose steps each lonely haunt explore
Of nymph or naiad,—grove, or rock, or stream—
Nature his guide, his object, and his theme.
Ah no—Darassah's eyes these forms survey
As phantoms of a half-remembered dream:
His eyes are on the water's glittering play:
Their mental sense is closed—his thoughts are far away.

III.

But central in the flood of liquid light,
A sudden spot its widening orb revealed,
Jet-black amid the mirrored beams of night,
Jet-black and round as Celtic warrior's shield,
A sable circle in a silver field.
With sense recalled and motionless surprise,
Deeming some fearful mystery there concealed,
He marked that shadowy orb's expanding size,
Till slowly from its breast a form began to rise.

IV.

A female form: and even as marble pale
Her cheeks: her eyes unearthly fire illumed:
Far o'er her shoulders streamed a sable veil,
Where flowers of living flame inwoven bloomed;
No mortal robe might bear them unconsumed:
A crown her temples bound: on such ne'er gazed
Eyes that had seen primeval kings entombed:
Twelve points it bore: on every point upraised
A star—a heavenly star—with dazzling radiance blazed.

V.

Lovely she was—not loveliness that might
In mortal heart enkindle light desire—
But such as decked the form of youthful Night,
When, on the bosom of her ——[1] sire,
With gentler passion she did first inspire
The gloomy soul of Erebus severe;
Ere from her breast, on wings of golden fire,
Primordial love sprang o'er the infant sphere,
And bade young Time arise and lead the vernal year.

VI.

Her right hand held a wand, whose potent sway
Her liquid path, the buoyant waves, obeyed,
Still as she moved, the moon-beams died away,
And shade around her fell—a circling shade—
That gave no outline of the wondrous maid.
Her form—soft-gliding as the summer gale—
In that portentous darkness shone arrayed,
Shone by her starry crown, her fiery veil,
And those refulgent eyes that made their radiance pale.

VII.

'Why—simple dweller of the Araxian isle'—
Thus, as she passed the shore, the genius said—
'Seek'st thou this spot, to muse and mourn the while,
Beside this river's ever murmuring bed,
When gentle sleep has her dominion spread
On every living thing around but thee?
The silent stars, that twinkle o'er thy head,
Shed rest and peace on hill, and flower, and tree;
All but the eternal stream, that flows melodiously.'

VIII.

Solemn her voice, as music vesper peal
From distant choir to cloistered echo borne,
Where the deep notes through pillared twilight steal,
Breathing tranquillity to souls that mourn.
The awe-struck youth replied: 'Of one so lorn
Can'st thou, empyreal spirit, deign require
The secret woes by which his soul is torn?
Sure from the fountain of eternal fire
Thy wondrous birth began, great Mithra's self thy sire.

IX.

'Through many an age amid these island bowers
The simple fathers of our race have dwelt:
To them spontaneous nature fruits and flowers,
By toil unsought, with partial bounty dealt:
At Oromazes' sylvan shrine they knelt.
And morn and eve did choral suppliance flow
From hearts that love and mingled reverence felt,
To him who gave them every bliss to know
That simple hearts can wish, or heavenly love bestow

[1] Word illegible.

X.

'But years passed on, and strange perversion ran
Among the dwellers of the peaceful isle:
And one, more daring than the rest, began
To fell the grove, and point the mossy pile;
And raised the circling fence, with evil wile,
And to his brethren said: These bounds are mine:
And did with living victims first defile
The verdant turf of Oromazes' shrine;
Sad offering sure, and strange, to mercy's source divine.

XI.

'And ill example evil followers drew;
Till common good and common right were made
The fraudful tenure of a powerful few:
The many murmured, trembled, and obeyed.
Then peace and freedom fled the sylvan shade,
And care arose, and toil, unknown before:
And some the hollowed alder's trunk essayed,
And left, with tearful eyes, their natal shore.
Swift down the stream they went, and they returned no more.

XII.

'And I too, oft, beyond that barrier-rock,
That hides from view the river's onward way—
Where, eddying round its base with ceaseless shock,
The waves, that flash, and disappear for aye,
Their parting murmurs to my ear convey—
In fancy turn my meditative gaze,
And trace, encircled by their powerful sway,
Some blooming isle, where love unfettered strays,
And peace and freedom dwell, as here in earlier days.

XIII.

But one there is, for whom my tears are shed;
A maid of wealthier lot and prouder line:
With her my happy infant hours I led;
And sweet our mutual task; at morn to twine
The votive wreath round Oromazes' shrine—
She mourns a captive in her father's home—
Alone I rove, to murmur and repine—
Alone, where sparkling waves symphonious foam,
I breathe my secret pangs to heaven's empyreal dome.'

XIV.

'Leave tears to slaves'—the genius answering said—
'Adventurous deed the noble mind beseems.
Oh shame to manhood! thus, with listless tread,
In tears and sighs and inconclusive dreams
To waste thy hours by groves and murmuring streams.
I bring thee power for weakness, joy for woe,
And certain bliss for hope's fallacious schemes,
Unless thou lightly thy own weal forego,
And soon the splendid lot thy bounteous fates bestow.

XV.

'This gifted ring shall every barrier break:
The maid thou lovest thy wandering steps shall share:
When night returns, with her this isle forsake,
From this thy favored haunt: my guardian care
To waft ye hence, the vessel shall prepare.
The monarch of the world hath chosen thee
High trust, and power, and dignity to bear,
I come, obedient to his high decree,
To set from error's spell thy captive senses free.

XVI.

'Deem'st thou, when blood of living victims flows,
'Mid incense smoke, in denser volumes curled,
That Oromazes there a glance bestows,
A glance of joy, to see the death-blow hurled?
No—far remote in orient clouds enfurled;
Nor prayer nor sacrificial rite he heeds.
His reign is past: his rival rules the world.
From Ahrimanes now all power proceeds:
For him the altar burns: for him the victim bleeds.

XVII.

'Parent of being, mistress of the spheres,
Supreme Necessity o'er all doth reign:
She guides the course of the revolving years,
With power no prayers can change, no force restrain;
Binding all nature in her golden chain,
Whose infinite connection links afar
The smallest atom of the sandy plain
And the last ray of heaven's remotest star,
That round the verge of space wheels its refulgent car.

XVIII.

'She to two gods, sole agents of her will,
By turns has given her delegated sway:
Her sovereign laws obedient they fulfil:
Inferior powers their high behests obey.
First Oromazes—lord of peace and day—
Dominion held o'er nature and mankind.
Now Ahrimanes rules, and holds his way
In storms: for such his task by her assigned,
To shake the world with war, and rouse the powers of mind.

XIX.

'She first on chaos poured the streams of light,
And bade from that mysterious union rise
Primordial love: the heavenly lion's might
Bore him rejoicing through the new-born skies.
Then glowed the infant world with countless dyes
Of fruits and flowers: and virgin nature smiled
Emerging first from ancient night's disguise
And elemental discord, vast and wild,
Which primogenial love had charmed and reconciled.

XX.

'Then man arose: to him the world was given,
Unknowing then disease, or storm, or death:
The eternal balance, in the central heaven,
Marked the free tenure of his equal birth,
And equal right to all the bounteous earth
Of fruit or flower, his pristine food, might yield.
Nor private roof he knew, nor blazing hearth,
Nor marked with barrier-lines the fruitful fields,
Nor learned in martial strife the uprooted oak to wield.

XXI.

'Then Oromazes reigned. Profoundly calm
His empire, as the lake's unruffled breast,
When evening twilight melts in dews of balm,
And rocks and woods in calm reflection rest,
As if for aye indelibly imprest.
Were those fair forms, in peerless light arrayed.
No sigh, no wish, the peaceful heart confest;
Save when the youth, beneath the myrtle shade,
Wooed to his fond embrace the easy-yielding maid.

XXII.

'No pillared fanes to Oromazes rose:
For him no priest the destined victim led.
The choral hymn, in swelling sound that flows,
Where round the marble altar streaming red
The slow procession moves with solemn tread,
His empire owned not:—but his bounty grew,
By prayer or hymn nor sought nor merited:
No altar but the peaceful heart he knew—
His only temple-vault, the heaven's ethereal blue.

XXIII.

'Such was the infant world, and such the reign
Of cloudless sunshine and oblivious joy;
Till rose the scorpion in the empyreal plain,
In fated hour, their empire to destroy,
And with unwonted cares the course alloy
Of mortal being and terrestrial time;
That man might all his god-like powers employ
The toilsome steep of wealth and fame to climb,
To rugged labor trained and glory's thirst sublime.

XXIV.

'To Ahrimanes thus devolved the power,
Which still he holds through all the realms of space.
He bade the sea to swell—the storm to lower—
And taught mankind the pliant bow to brace,
And point the shaft, and urge the sounding chace,
And force from veins of flint the seeds of fire;
Till, as more daring thoughts found gradual place,
He bade the mind to nobler prey aspire,
Of war and martial fame kindling the high desire.

XXV.

'For him on earth unnumbered temples rise,
And altars burn, and bleeding victims die:
Albeit the sons of men his name disguise
In other names that choice or chance supply,
To him alone their incense soars on high.
The god of armies—the avenging god—
Seva or Allah—Jove or Mars—they cry:
'Tis Ahrimanes still that wields the rod;
To him all nature bends, and trembles at his nod.

XXVI.

'Yea, even on Oromazes' self they call,
But Ahrimanes hears their secret prayer.
Not in the name that from the lips may fall,
But in the thought the heart's recesses bear
The sons of earth the power they serve declare.
Wherever priests awake the battle-strain,
And bid the torch of persecution glare,
And curses ring along the vaulted fane—
Call on what name they may—their god is Ahrimane.

XXVII.

'Favor to few, to many wrath he shews:
None with impunity his power may brave.
Two classes only of mankind he knows,
The lord and serf—the tyrant and the slave.
Some hermit sage, where lonely torrents rave,
May muse and dream of Oromazes still:
Despised he lives, and finds a nameless grave.
The chiefs and monarchs of the world fulfil
——[1] Ahrimanes behests—the creatures of his will.

XXVIII.

'Say—hadst thou rather grovel with the crowd,
The wretched thing and tool of lordly might,
Or, where the battle-clarion brays aloud,
Blaze forth conspicuous in the fields of fight,
And bind thy brow with victory's chaplet bright,
And be the king of men?—Thy choice is free.—
Receive the ring.—Observe the coming night.—
The monarch of the world hath chosen thee
To spread his name on earth, in power and majesty.'—

XXIX.

She said and gave the ring. The youth received
The glittering spell, in awe and mute amaze
Standing like one almost of sense bereaved,
That fixes on the vacant air his gaze,
Where wildered fancy's troubled eye surveys
Dim-flitting forms, obscure and undefined,
That doubtful thoughts and shadowy feelings raise,
Leaving a settled image on the mind:
Like cloud-built rocks and towers, dissolved ere half-combined.

[1] Word illegible.

XXX.

Nor stayed she longer pale: but round her form
A sable vapor, thickly mantling drew
Its volumed folds, dark as the summer storm.
It wrapped her round, and in an instant flew,
Scattered like mist, though not a zephyr blew,
And left no vestige that she there had been.
The river rolled in light. The moonbeams threw
Their purest radiance on the lovely scene;
And hill, and grove, and rock, slept in the ray serene.

Canto II.

I.

Spake the dark genius truly, when she said,
That Ahrimanes rules this mundane ball?
That man in toil and darkness doomed to tread,
Ambition's slave and superstition's thrall,
Doth only on the power of evil call,
With hymn and prayer, and votive altar's blaze?
Alas! whenever guiltless victims fall[1],
Wherever priest the sword of strife displays
Small trace is there, I ween, of ancient Oromaze.

II.

Yet if on earth a single spot there be,
Where fraud, corruption, selfishness and pride
Wear not the specious robes of sanctity,
With hypocritic malice to divide
The bonds of love and peace by nature tied
'Twixt man and man, far as the billows roll,—
Where idle tales, that truth and sense deride,
Claim no dominion o'er the subject soul,—
There Oromazes still exerts his mild control.

III.

But not in fanes where priestly curses ring,—
Not in the venal court, the servile camp,—
Not where the slaves of a voluptuous king
Would fain o'erwhelm, in flattery's poison-clamp,—
Truth's vestal torch and love's Promethean lamp,—
Not where the tools of tyrants bite the ground,
'Mid broken swords and steeds' ensanguined tramp,
To add one gem to those that now surround
Some pampered baby's brow,—may trace of him be found.

[1] 'It is possible to sacrifice victims—human victims—without cutting their throats or shedding a drop of their blood and that too under the name and with the specious form of justice. It is possible to display the sword of strife and be a very effective member of the church militant without the visible employment of temporal weapons. If a man can be robbed of his liberty and his property for the calm exposition of his opinions on speculative subjects it is of little consequence whether the instrument of oppression be a grand inquisition or an attorney general.' (This is crossed through in pencil and appears to be an allusion to Shelley.)

IV.

The star of day rolled on the radiant hours,
And sunk again behind the western steep.
The dews of twilight bathed the closing flowers.
The full-orbed moon, amid the empyreal deep,
Restored the reign of silence and of sleep.
Again Darassah seeks the moonlit shore,
But comes not now in solitude to weep:
He leads the maid his inmost thoughts adore,
To tempt with him the stream, and unknown scenes explore.

V.

A bark is on the shore: the rippling wave
With gentle murmur chafes against its sides.
Shrinks not the maid, that barrier-rock to brave,
Whose jutting base the eddying river chides?
Fear finds no place, where mightier love presides.
They press the bark: the waters gently flow:
The light sail swells: the steady vessel glides:
The favouring breeze still follows as they go:
They pass the barrier-rock: they haste to weal or woe.

VI.

He holds the helm: beside him sits the maid:
Her arms around her lover's form are twined:
Her head upon her lover's breast is laid:
Pressed to his heart, in tenderest rest reclined,
Lulled by the symphony of wave and wind,
To lonely isles and citron-groves she flies
(By fancy's spell in fondest dreams enshrined),
Where love, and health, and peaceful thoughts suffice
To renovate the bowers of earthly paradise.

VII.

Less pure Darassah's thoughts: ambition's spell
Had touched his soul, and dreams of power and fame;
But feeble yet, and vague: nor knew he well,
Whence those disturbed imaginations came,
That touched his breast with no benignant flame.
No state too proud, no destiny too high,
For her he loved his wildest thought could frame.
What might not that mysterious ring supply,
That now had given her love, and life, and liberty?

VIII.

But the calm elements—the placid moon—
The stars, that round her rolled in still array—
The plaintive breeze—the stream's responsive tune—
The rapid water's silver-eddying play,
That tracked in lines of light their onward way—
The solemn rocks, in mossy shade that frowned—
The groves; where light and darkness chequering lay—
Breathed on his mind the peace that reigned around,
And checked each turbid thought that erst had entrance found.

IX.

The nightingale sang sweetly in the shade:
The dewy rose breathed fragrance on the air.
Who now more blest than that fond youth and maid,
Whom the swift waters of Araxes bear,
One common lot, or good or ill, to share?
If ill—light falls the shaft of adverse fate,
When mutual love assuages mutual care:
If good—can bliss the feeling mind await,
Unless one tender heart its joys participate?

X.

So thought Kelasris, wrapped in dreams of hope;
Nor deemed how soon, in time's delusive reign,
The brightest tints of youthful fancy's scope
Fade in the vast reality of pain,
That speaks the omnipotence of Ahrimane.
But while the light bark glided fast and free
And not a cloud obscured the ethereal plain,
The gale—the stream—the night-bird's melody—
Touched in her soul the chords of tenderer harmony.

XI.

The stars grow pale, and o'er the western verge
Of heaven the moon her parting orb suspends;
She sinks behind the hill. The eddying surge
Reflects the deepening blush that morning lends
To eastern mountain's top, where softly blends
Its misty outline with the reddening sky.
Tow'rd heaven's high arch the lark exulting tends:
Lost in the depth, invisible on high,
He makes the rocks resound with his sweet minstrelsy.

XII.

The sun comes forth upon the mountain top.
The wide earth feels his vivifying sway.
The dewy flowers unclose, and every drop
Light trembling on the leaf—the moss—the spray—
Beams like a diamond in the streams of day:
All nature glitters like an orient bride,
Whom countless gems and fairest flowers array.
The scattered mountain mist flies fast and wide,
Like incense to the shrine of morning's radiant pride[1].

XIII.

The bark glides swiftly on: new scenes expand
In day's full splendour now distinctly seen.
The light acacia blooms along the strand.
Deep groves of pine, where laurels wave between,

[1] This stanza was changed by Peacock. Lines 2, 6, and 7 are crossed through and the following alternative given for the last two lines:

The scattered mist flies far the heaven upborne
Like earth's glad incense to the shrine of morn.

Rear their dark tufts of everlasting green:
The sunbeams on the glossy laurel play,
A trembling flood of silver-radiance sheen.
Now the vast oak o'ercanopies their way;
And now the beetling crag, with sapless lichens gray[1].

This fragment of the poem that Peacock intended to complete in twelve cantos reflects the same opposition to established institutions and beliefs that was shared by Shelley and his friends. Hogg has related several anecdotes about one of these whom he calls 'J. F. N.' and to whom Peacock alludes under the same initials. This gentleman was a Mr Newton who first met Shelley on August 5, 1812. His wife's sister was the Mrs de Boinville whom Shelley once described in a letter to Peacock as 'the most admirable specimen of a human being I had ever seen,' and who, with her daughter Cornelia Turner, was the means of initiating Shelley and Hogg into the beauties of Italian poetry. This lady possessed a house at Bracknell in Berkshire where Shelley frequently stayed after he had given up his own country house there. He was naturally attracted by Mr Newton's firm belief in vegetarianism which had been expressed in his essay entitled *The Return to Nature* printed in 1810—three years before Shelley published his own pamphlet *A Vindication of Natural Diet* on exactly the same subject and with precisely the same tendency. It was while staying with Shelley that Peacock met Mr Newton at Bracknell in 1813 and we know from his correspondence with Shelley that he was in the habit of meeting the De Boinvilles—and therefore probably the Newtons—as late as 1819. In his *Memoirs of Shelley,* Peacock has given us some information about Mr Newton which supplies the source from which he derived the poem *Ahrimanes,* although he himself makes no allusion to it whatever. (See Cole's edition of Peacock's *Works,* Vol. III, pp. 405, 406.) According to him Mr Newton was the 'best worth remembering' of Shelley's strange and eccentric friends at Bracknell:

He was an estimable man and an agreeable companion, and he was not the less amusing that he was the absolute impersonation of a single theory, or rather of two single theories rolled into one. He held that all diseases and all aberrations, moral and physical, had their origin in the use of animal food and of fermented and spirituous liquors; that the universal adoption of a diet of roots, fruits, and distilled water, would restore the golden age of universal health, purity, and peace; that this most ancient and sublime morality was mystically inculcated in the most ancient Zodiac, which was that of Dendera; that this Zodiac was divided into two hemispheres, the upper hemisphere being the realm of Oromazes or the principle of good, the lower that of Ahrimanes or the principle of evil; that each of these hemispheres was again divided into two compartments, and that the four lines of division radiating from the centre were the prototype of the Christian cross.

[1] Peacock crossed through lines 2, 6 and 7, but substituted nothing in their place.

The two compartments of Oromazes were those of Uranus or Brahma the Creator, and of Saturn or Veishnu the Preserver. The two compartments of Ahrimanes were those of Jupiter or Seva the Destroyer, and of Apollo or Krishna the Restorer. The great moral doctrine was thus symbolized in the Zodiacal signs :—In the first compartment, Taurus the Bull, having in the ancient Zodiac a torch in his mouth, was the type of eternal light. Cancer the Crab was the type of celestial matter, sleeping under the all-covering water, on which Brahma floated in a lotus-flower for millions of ages. From the union, typified by Gemini, of light and celestial matter, issued in the second compartment Leo, Primogenial Love, mounted on the back of a Lion, who produced the pure and perfect nature of things in Virgo, and Libra the Balance denoted the coincidence of the ecliptic with the equator, and the equality of man's happy existence. In the third compartment, the first entrance of evil into the system was typified by the change of celestial into terrestrial matter—Cancer into Scorpio. Under this evil influence man became a hunter, Sagittarius the Archer, and pursued the wild animals, typified by Capricorn. Then, with animal food and cookery, came death into the world, and all our woe. But in the fourth compartment, Dhanwantari or Æsculapius, Aquarius the Waterman, arose from the sea, typified by Pisces the Fish, with a jug of pure water and a bunch of fruit, and brought back the period of universal happiness under Aries the Ram, whose benignant ascendancy was the golden fleece of the Argonauts, and the true talisman of Oromazes.

It can be easily seen by comparing *Ahrimanes* with the above account of Mr Newton's crotchet for zodiacal representation that Peacock was indebted to him not only for the underlying idea of his poem but for many of its details as well. This is still further proved by the following outline of the poem, written by its author, which is useful for purposes of comparison and as indicating, at any rate, to some extent what *Ahrimanes* would have been like had it ever reached completion.

Necessity governs the world. Subordinate to her are four principal genii; the creating, the preserving, the destroying and the restoring spirits. Obedient to her first command the creating spirit El-Oran poured light on chaos from which mysterious union arose primogenial love. Under his vivifying influence nature originated and existed in purity. This being accomplished in its destined period, the preserving spirit—Oromazes—assumed his delegated empire and ruled the infancy of nature when all was equality and happiness. This destined period being likewise accomplished the destroyer—Ahrimanes—assumed his sway. He brought with him into the world long species of moral and physical evil, and first corrupted the nature of man by making him a hunter and giving him a thirst for blood, whence originated war and discord and turbulence, the selfish thirst of unbounded possession, the atrocities of avarice and tyranny and superstition. Under his iron reign we live anticipating the destined period of the restoring power.

When the reign of the preserving spirit was ended he retired with his genii to the extremities of the south, where he drew an impenetrable veil around the bowers of his repose. The mariner then glides over a boundless ocean and seeks in vain the shores of the southern world.

And some of his genii come forth from time to time to mingle with mankind knowing that through their ministry must the reign of the restorer be brought on. Thus the world is never totally abandoned by the spirits of good. Few indeed are the favoured mortals that can know and feel their influence: but to them is given an impulse and a power of mind which rises triumphant over all the tyranny of Ahrimanes. They fix their eyes on the high futurity promised to their posterity

and hold their steady course through the evil of life like the iron bark of the enchanter through the waves of the storm, which remained one and indissoluble amid the wildish [? wildest] conflicts of wind and sea which might be submerged by superior power but could neither be changed nor broken.

Such is the picture of the virtuous man struggling with calamity—a picture which the preserver contemplates with joy from his southern paradise, which the restorer hails with anticipative delight as the omen of his terrestrial reign.

When Ahrimanes first assumed his sway over man and the world his genii rapidly effected their task of misery and corruption. Blood flowed in feuds and in war at the beck of tyrants and on the altar of superstition where he was worshipped under unnumbered names by the abject and terrified race of man. He delighted in the spectacle of war and desolation: he sent forth beasts of prey and signalised his dominion by storms and earthquakes and volcanoes. Men fell prostrate before him and only seemed emulous who should be his most effectual votaries. But as he threw his glance over the world he discovered that some of the genii of Oromazes still lingered among mankind in the mountain-vales and by the shores of the lonely torrents and that some individuals of the human race still resisted his power.

In particular he distinguished an island in the Araxes where the inhabitants yet lived in primitive simplicity. To this island he despatched a chosen number of his genii. They effected their task of corruption with rapidity: but two lovers Darassah and Kelasris remained incorruptible. Against these therefore they directed the full torrent of their vengeance. The genii of Oromazes watch over their fate: but the power of the evil genii becomes gradually superior. Discord and violence and rapine now reign among the islanders. The father of Kelasris tears her from Darassah to give her to another. She flies to her lover's cottage whither she is pursued but he succeeds in conveying her to the shore of the Araxes where they find a boat in which they embark.

Descending the stream they take refuge among some peasants—worshippers of Oromazes. An inundation of the river destroys the village. Driven from their asylum they wander a long and weary way and at length arrive at a city, where they observe innumerable pictures of misery and vice. The sultan sees Kelasris, forcibly takes her from her lover and confines her in his seraglio. Darassah ineffectually attempts to defend her and is conveyed to a prison. At midnight the city is besieged by a hostile force—taken and sacked—the prison is broken open—the seraglio is on fire. Darassah enters it, finds Kelasris and escapes with her to the deserts. They live peacefully in an oasis.

They discover a vast body of sand rushing towards them from a distance. They escape but the oasis is buried. They fall into the power of robbers who sell them as slaves. Darassah is sent to labour in a diamond mine. The Ahrimannic genius of the mines addresses him. He escapes from the mine and enters a deep forest. Despair and meditated suicide. He meets Kelasris accompanied by a beautiful female who has escaped with her from the seraglio to which the Arabs had sold her. The noise of pursuit is heard. They fly. A temple of Oromazes appears in view. The high priest makes his appearance. They appeal to his protection which he promises. The sultan appears. The priest says he cannot oppose God's vicegerent on earth and is about to deliver up his applicants when the female companion of Kelasris discovers herself to be an Oromazic genius. She reprobates the priest for profaning the name of Oromazes by calling himself his minister when he is in reality the slave of Ahrimanes, but as the dedication of the temple to his name gives Oromazes power over it she will destroy it and its pernicious minister. She destroys the temple, but an Ahrimannic genius interposes and saves the priest saying that priests and kings are the peculiar objects of the care of Ahrimanes and that while they serve him faithfully they shall be safe.

The lovers escape to a city on the shore of the Persian gulf. The city is afflicted with famine and pestilence. Darassah is seized by the latter. Kelasris attends him. He recovers. They embark on board a vessel in the port and sail into the Pacific Ocean. Storm and shipwreck. Darassah is thrown on shore and afterwards Kelasris—apparently dead. Here they find a simple people. A volcanic

eruption devastates the island. An Ahrimannic genius appears and desires them to pay homage to Ahrimanes. They refuse. The Oromazic spirit appears, commends them and tells them they are worthy to participate in the happiness of the southern world : intermingling her speech with a prophecy of the restorer. She then directs them to embark in a small boat which will bear them to the dwellings of Oromazes. The poem concludes by depicting the submersion of the island and the departure of the lovers for the southern world. The boat sails securely on, though assailed by violent tempests raised by Ahrimannic spirits imaging the course of virtue through the storms of life.

It only remains to conjecture why Peacock did not bring to a conclusion this poem of which he had mapped out such a big plan and which he had started in such a promising way. Soon after he probably began it the first novel *Headlong Hall* appeared, to be followed at fairly regular intervals by four others. It is true that his most lengthy effort as a poet—*Rhododaphne*—appeared in 1818; but apart from this his attention was, for the most part, turned aside from poetry and directed into a new channel. Perhaps also he could not reconcile himself with Mr Newton's idea that the restoring power should eventually gain the upper hand, and did not care to alter this by deviating from the theory of the friend from whom he had borrowed his plot. For in spite of the antagonism to all forms of revealed religion, and to nearly all social institutions together with those that support them, which he shared with Shelley and which he has given vent to in his description of Ahrimannic rule, he did not share his young friend's passion for reforming mankind or his enthusiastic and idealistic belief in the future destiny of the world. It is therefore quite possible that he did not continue the narrative of Darassah and Kelasris—which notwithstanding all the obstacles they meet is distinctly a record of progress—because he did not wish to ridicule himself by adding one more contradiction of his own sentiments and convictions to the bundle of inconsistencies which his interesting works curiously enough contain.

A. B. Young.

London.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

Gascoigne and Shakspere.

Halpin's theory (or rather Boaden's, to give credit to the true originator) that a well-known passage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (II, i, 148—168) refers to the Kenilworth festivities has been generally accepted, though the suggestion that Shakspere described the incidents from his recollection of a visit made as a boy of eleven seems fanciful. He is more likely to have come across the account of the festivities in the contemporary pamphlet, or in the reprint of it in Gascoigne's collected works of 1587, which seem to have had a large circulation, if one may judge from the numerous copies surviving in various libraries. In Gascoigne's account we have the 'fireworks shewed upon the water'; '*Tryton* in likenesse of a Mermaide.....commanding...the waves to be calme'; and '*Protheus*.....sitting on a *Dolphyns* backe.....With in the which *Dolphyn* a Consort of Musicke was secretely placed'—presumably the originals of the

> mermaid, on a dolphin's back,
> Uttering such dulcet and harmonious breath,
> That the rude sea grew civil at her song,
> And certain stars shot madly from their spheres,
> To hear the sea-maid's music.

The 'fair vestal throned by the west' can only be Elizabeth, and Gascoigne himself describes the attack upon her heart which he had planned on Leicester's behalf. There was prepared a 'shew' to have been presented before her Majesty in the forest, the argument of which was Diana's concern over the loss of one of her best-beloved nymphs called Zabeta, suspected of having been won to the train of Juno.

'The Nimphes returne one after another in quest of *Zabeta*: at last *Diana* her selfe returning and hearing no newes of her, invoketh the helpe of her Father *Jupiter*. *Mercurie* commeth downe in a cloude sent by *Jupiter* to recomfort *Dyana*, and bringeth her unto *Zabeta*: *Dyana* rejoyceth, and after much freendly discourse departeth: affying her selfe in *Zabetaes* prudence and pollicie: She and *Mercurie* (being departed) *Iris* commeth downe from the Rainebowe sent by *Juno*: Perswad-

ing the Queenes Majestie that she be not caryed away with *Mercuries* filed speach, nor *Dyanaes* faire words, but that she consider all things by proofe, and then shee shall finde much greater cause to followe *Juno* then *Dyana*.'

It would be no wonder if the Queen refused to give ear to the uncommonly direct hint contained in the concluding words of Iris:

Then geve consent O Queene,
to *Junoes* just desire
Who for your wealth would have you wed,
and for your farther hire
Some Empresse wil you make,
she bad me tell you thus:
Forgeve me (Queene) the words are hers,
I come not to discusse.
I am but Messenger,
but sure she bade me say,
That where you now in Princely port,
have past one pleasant day:
A world of wealth at wil,
you hencefoorth shall enjoy
In wedded state, and therewithall,
holde up from great annoy
The staffe of your estate:
O Queene, O worthy Queene,
Yet never wight felt perfect blis,
but such as wedded beene.

'This shewe was devised and penned by M. Gascoigne, and being prepared and redy (every Actor in his garment) two or three dayes together, yet never came to execution. The cause whereof I cannot attribute to any other thing, then to lack of opportunitie and seasonable weather.'

The weather was evidently wet, and the Queen hastened her departure, in spite of the lamentations of 'Deepe desire' from the holly bush.

The imperial votaress passed on,
In maiden meditation, fancy-free.

'Deepe desire' was long ago identified by Nicholls as the representative of Leicester's aspirations and regrets, but 'Due desert,' the other of the 'two sworne brethren which long time served hyr,' has not yet been satisfactorily interpreted. Yet it is obvious that some personal reference is intended by Gascoigne's mysterious phrases:

'She dyd long sithens convert *Due desert* into yonder same *Lawrell* tree. The which may very well be so, consideryng the *Etimologie* of his name, for we see that the *Lawrel braunch* is a token of triumph, in all *Tropheis* and given as a reward to all Victors, a dignitie for all degrees, consecrated and dedicate to *Apollo* and the *Muses* as a worthie flower, leafe or braunch, for their due deserts. Of him I will hold no longer discourse, because hee was *Metomorphosed* before my tyme, for your Majestie must understand that I have not long helde this charge.'

Might not Walter Devereux, Earl of Essex, be intended by 'Due desert'? In the previous March he had been appointed Earl Marshall

of Ireland, and he was away campaigning at the time of the Kenilworth festivities. He had some reputation, not only as a general, but as a man of letters; he was said to be particularly interested in the study of history, and there are extant certain poems which are ascribed to him. His house, Chartley Castle, was the next great estate Elizabeth visited on this progress. There she was entertained by Lettice, Countess of Essex, who had been present at Kenilworth, and who, according to the received interpretation of the passage in *A Midsummer Night's Dream*, was the 'little western flower,' upon whom 'the bolt of Cupid fell.' It is certain that Leicester's attentions to her had by this time already begun to excite remark, and that he was secretly married to her within two years of her husband's death.

Mr Dover Wilson has suggested that in the prologue to *Pyramus and Thisbe* Shakspere was parodying Gascoigne's prologue to *The Glasse of Governement*. It is in the same measure (? Bottom's 'eight and eight'), with the same arrangement of alternate rhymes ending with a couplet; and there is possibly an intentional echo of Gascoigne's unhappy phrases:

> What man hath minde to heare a worthie Jest,
> Or seekes to feede his eye with vayne delight:
> That man is much unmeete to be a guest,
> At such a feaste as I prepare this night.

This disavowal of the intent to please might be ludicrously recalled by Quince's 'If we offend, it is with our good will'; and Shakspere's later lines:

> We do not come, as minding to content you,
> Our true intent is,

reproduced the very words of Gascoigne's prologue

> Content you then (my Lordes) with good intent,

though the resemblance may be merely accidental.

JOHN W. CUNLIFFE.

MADISON, WIS. U.S.A.

THE TITLE OF BURTON'S 'ANATOMY OF MELANCHOLY.'

Robert Burton in the first part of the title-page of his *Anatomy* (or *Melancholy*, as it should rather be called[1]) might seem to be indebted to a passage in Salustius Salvianus' *Variarum Lectionum de re medica*

[1] Cf. the Appendix to Burton's Will, where he leaves 'half my Melancholy Copy' to be disposed of by his executors.

libri tres, lib. ii, cap. 1 ('De Melancholia & Mania morbo, & eius curatione'), p. 95, Rome, 1588 (the edition which Burton apparently used): 'Quinque a nobis veniunt consideranda de Melancholia, & Mania, primo quid sit, secundo quaenam sint causae huius affectionis, tertio signa, quarto prognosticum, quinto, & vltimo curationem' [sic]. Compare 'The | Anatomy of | Melancholy: | What it is. | With all the Kindes, Cav- | ses, Symptomes, Prognosticks, | and Severall Cvres of it' (Second edition[1], 1624). Burton frequently quotes from Salustius Salvianus.

But the division here employed was not uncommon. See Partition 1, sect. 1, memb. 1, subs. 3, 'which [sc. the diseases of the mind] I will briefly touch and point out, insisting especially in this of *Melancholy*, as more eminent then the rest, and that through all his kindes, causes, symptomes, prognostickes, cures: As *Lonicerus* hath done *de Apoplexiâ*, and many others, of many such particular diseases.'

In any case this division, like so much else in Burton's book, is no quaintness or peculiarity of the author, but something natural to anyone writing a serious and practical treatise on the subject.

Edward Bensly.

Aberystwyth.

Chaucer's Captivity.

It will be remembered that Chaucer was taken prisoner in the French Campaign of 1359–60, and that he himself testifies, in the Scrope-Grosvenor case, that before his captivity he saw Sir Richard Scrope 'before the town of *Retters*.' This Sir Harris Nicolas would have identified with Retiers in Brittany; but modern editors had far more probably conjectured *Réthel* in the Ardennes. This conjecture is proved beyond doubt by a passage in Sir Thomas Gray's *Scalacronica*, which I here subjoin:

> Le prince [de Galles] tient soun auant dit chemin par Seint Quyntin & par Retieris, ou ly enemys meismes arderoint lour vile pur destourber lour passage, les gentz de qi conquistrent passage au chastel Purcien, ou passa par Champain, aprocha lost soun pier adeuant de Reyns. (*Scalacronica*, ed. Stevenson. Maitland Club, 1836, p. 188.)

Gray's information about Edward III's campaigns is unusually detailed and trustworthy; and from this passage it plainly appears (i) that *Retieris* = Réthel; for Château-Porcien is a large village in the *arrondissement* of Réthel, and (ii) that Chaucer was in the Black

[1] I quote from this edition as the first is not at hand.

Prince's division—for Edward had divided his great army into three columns, commanded by himself, the Black Prince, and Henry Duke of Lancaster, which effected a junction at Reims. Interesting details of the route of Chaucer's division, and the fighting by the way, are given by Gray a few lines above this passage.

G. G. Coulton.

Eastbourne.

'Pierce the Plowmans Crede,' 372.

Leeue it well, lef man· and men ryȝt-lokede,
Þer is more pryue pride· in Prechours hertes
Þan þer lefte in Lucyfer· er he were lowe fallen.

Both in his *Specimens of English Literature*, 1394–1579, and in his recent edition of the *Crede* (1906), Professor Skeat explains 'ryȝt-lokede' as 'righteous, just,' from A.-S. 'rihtlic,' with which it seems difficult to connect it phonetically. Is it possible that the hyphen is wrong, and that the phrase means 'if one looked (i.e. observed) aright'? 'Men' would then be the phonetic weakening of 'man,' as in Chaucer, *C. T.*, *Prologue*, 149, 'Or if men smoot it with a yerde smerte.' Stratmann gives four instances of the form 'lokede' in M.E.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

Occleve, 'De Regimine Principum,' 299, 621.

Also who was hyer in philosofye
To Aristotle in our tunge but thow?

Professor Skeat in the glossary to his *Specimens* explains 'hyer' as 'higher.' But should not the right reading be 'heyr'='heir'? Can one say 'higher to' for 'higher than'? Besides, if this were possible, the context is against it. Occleve in his *Lament for Chaucer*, says of the poet, 'to Tullius was neuer man *so like* amonges vs,' and 'The steppes of Virgile in poysye thou *folwedest* eke.' Is it likely, considering the estimation of Aristotle in the middle ages, that Occleve would make Chaucer his superior in philosophy, after making him only equal to Cicero in rhetoric and inferior to Virgil in poetry? Whereas to make him his 'heir' would be perfectly consistent.

But or they twynned thens they pekked moode.

Professor Skeat explains 'pekked moode' as 'pecked mud; or, as we should now say, ate dirt.' But, apart from the improbability of 'mud' being spelt 'moode,' the phrase occurs in Skelton, *Against the Scottes* (Dyce, I, p. 189), 'Who so therat pyketh mood, The tokens are not good To be true Englysh blood,' where Dyce explains it as 'grows angry, picks a quarrel,' and this meaning suits both passages.

W. H. Williams.

Hobart, Tasmania.

Fragment of an Unknown Middle English Poem.

The following poem is found in a manuscript copy of a late thirteenth century law treatise at Lincoln's Inn, Hale 135. What are now the fly-leaves were originally the covers of this manuscript. Two of these leaves contain a mass of memoranda relating to one Alan de Thornton and extending in chronological order from 1297 to 1311. The poem is written at the top of a page and immediately before a memorandum for 31 Edward I. Although written in a hand different to that of any of the other entries it is clearly of the same period, and there is no reason for doubting that it was inserted before the memoranda which follow it. We may therefore date it at least as early as 1303. Unfortunately that part of the poem which was written near the outer edge of the page has become so rubbed and worn that some of the words are obliterated.

No(w) spri(nke)s the sprai. al for loue icche am so seeke that slepen ine mai. this endre dai als( )i me rode o mi.....s...h( )i hwar a litel mai bigan to singge. the clot him clingges wai es him i louue l(on)g(in)ge sal libben ai. Nou sprinkes, etc. Son icche herde that mirie note yider i drogh i fonde hire...an herber swot under a bogh. With ioie inogh. son i asked thou mirie mai hwi sinkes tou ai? Nou sprinkes the sprai, etc. than answerde that maiden swote midde wordes fewe. mi lemman me haues bi hot of louue trewe. he chaunges a newe. thiif i mai it shal him rewe. bi this dai. Now sprinkes.

George E. Woodbine.

London.

Dante, 'De Vulgari Eloquentia,' i, vii.

Since the appearance of the July number of this Review, containing a note from me on the phrase 'non ante tertium equitabis,' I have learnt from Mr A. G. Ferrers Howell that a similar explanation was suggested in a note to the second edition of his translation of the *De Vulgari Eloquentia* (Dent, 1904). I regret that I overlooked his prior publication; and rejoice to find that an interpretation which I have for the last dozen years felt certain was the true one, is confirmed by his authority and that of Mr Wicksteed, the general editor of Dante for the series.

A. J. Butler.

London.

DISCUSSIONS.

The Locality of 'King Lear,' Act I, Scene ii.

Mr Hunter, in his acute and interesting Note in the last number of the *Modern Language Review*, has given reasons for thinking that the scene of *King Lear*, I, ii, is still that of I, i, and not, as since Pope has been generally assumed, Gloucester's castle. And he believes that, when this is recognised, the apparent improbabilities of I, ii disappear. As in my *Shakespearean Tragedy* I have dwelt on these improbabilities, and as Mr Hunter refers to me, I should like to say a few words on his Note.

He has succeeded, I think, in showing (1) that, if we confine our attention to I, ii, we may most naturally take the scene to be that of I, i; (2) that, accordingly, we may suppose Gloucester, Edmund, and Edgar to be living under three separate roofs[1]; (3) that on this supposition some of the improbabilities of I, ii are considerably reduced (I cannot say more than this, but I leave the question undiscussed). His success confirms the very important rule that we ought never to accept without question the stage-directions of our editions. This rule I have tried to observe, and it should have led me to suspect that Pope's stage-direction here was wrong.

Mr Hunter's success, however, depends on a condition; and this condition is that we confine our attention to I, ii. Now obviously it is not safe to do this. And, if we extend our limits, what is the result?

After I, ii, 'the scene in which the Gloucester interest is next resumed' is II, i; and here the scene, says Mr Hunter, is undoubtedly laid, where it is usually placed, at Gloucester's castle (or house, as Shakespeare calls it). Now between I, ii and II, i a great deal has happened. The Fool has had time to pine away; there are rumours of dissension between Cornwall and Albany; Lear, who has been staying with Goneril, and has observed a change in her treatment of him, has quarrelled with her; he sets out to go to Regan, and, finding that she has left home for Gloucester's house, he is coming on there. Thus the interval between I, ii and II, i cannot be short, whether or no we

[1] This, however, is not 'clearly suggested,' much less 'actually proved,' by the explicit mention of Edmund's 'lodging.' The word in Shakespeare may perfectly well mean a mere room. See Schmidt.

suppose that Lear's words 'within a fortnight' (I, iv, 316) give an indication of its length[1].

What then have Gloucester, Edmund and Edgar been doing during this interval? According to Mr Hunter, in I, ii, on the day after the events of I, i, they are still at the place where those events occurred. I do not know why he calls this place a 'city,' but at any rate it is a place where Gloucester, Edmund, and Edgar are supposed to be under three separate roofs. Edmund shows the forged letter to his father. He is told to find Edgar and to apprehend him. He objects to the latter order, but promises to arrange for the father to overhear a conversation between the sons on the subject of the letter, 'and that without any further delay than this very evening.' He then persuades Edgar to keep out of his father's way for the present, to retire to his (Edmund's) lodging, and, if he stirs abroad, to go armed. The idea suggested is that the scene enacted in II, i is to take place at once, this very evening. But it does not; and when next (in II, i) we meet with Gloucester and his sons, that considerable interval has elapsed. Edmund, for some reason left totally unexplained, has failed to produce Edgar; and, during the interval, not only have Gloucester and Edmund gone into the country, but Edgar has gone too. *And he has gone to the same place!* While his father has set guard to catch him, he is concealed somewhere upstairs in his father's house (II, i, 19). Could anything be much more improbable,—except indeed Edgar's subsequent exploit of returning from his hollow tree to his father's house in order to deliver a soliloquy (see *Shakesp. Tragedy*, p. 260)? And, curious to relate, the place where we find Edgar in II, i, seems to us, as we read, to be just the place where, on the old hypothesis, we left him in I, ii, Edmund's room in Gloucester's house in the country.

What is the conclusion? That Mr Hunter's supposition is wrong? I do not say that. But I say that, on his supposition and on any other, the story is here grossly improbable, and the place-indications misty in the extreme.

I do not know whether it is of any use to go further; but, if we must make a hypothesis, perhaps the most probable is this. Shakespeare, if he imagined any place at all for I, ii (and I think it improbable that he did not), imagined the place of I, i. But it was not necessary for stage purposes to indicate a place, and he may have known that the spectators would not trouble their heads about the matter, and still less about the question of one roof or three. In II, i, on the other hand, it *was* necessary to have a definite place, for the plot required that almost all the chief persons should meet at Gloucester's house in the country. So he put Edgar into concealment in his father's house, confident that the spectators would not ask the awkward question how and when he got there. We, in studying the play, ask this question; and a stage-manager now has to ask it, because in our theatre everything happens

[1] This, I think, is the obvious interpretation, and it is that of Mr Daniel in his Time-analysis. But the meaning *might* be that Lear was required to dismiss fifty of his knights within the next fortnight.

somewhere in particular, and not on a bare platform as universal as the world. He would do best, I incline to think, to put I, ii where Pope put it, and to excise the indications of time. He would thus avoid the absurdity which follows on Mr Hunter's view,—a view, however, which (apart from the question of the three roofs) seems to me probably correct.

I should like to associate myself with Mr Hunter in his praise of Dr Perrett's excellent study[1].

A. C. Bradley.

London.

Wyatt and the French Sonneteers.

In a short note appended to his interesting article *The Elizabethan Sonneteers and the French Poets*[2], Prof. Kastner denies my thesis[3] that Saint-Gelais translated the sonnet 'Voyant ces monts de veue ainsi lointaine' from Wyatt. His comment is: 'This is *a priori* highly improbable, and Mr Berdan's arguments do not convince me.' To convince Prof. Kastner I must show that *a priori* the situation is sufficiently probable to merit consideration. This might be done by citing the few other borrowings in the French from the English—as is notably the case of Chaucer—by showing that the English language was understood at the Court of France—a condition which is historically probable—or by proving that the Italian influence, *Petrarchismo*, reached England before it reached France. If this last be true, *a priori* my contention is not highly improbable. This, then, is the way I shall try to meet the question.

The possibility of confusion here arises from the fact that, while Tottel's *Miscellany* represents the work of a past generation, it was not published until 1557, eight years later than the beginning of the Pléiade. Thus it is easy to class it mentally as the first of the Eliza-

[1] A word must be added on a small matter. I remarked in my book that Gloucester appears to be unacquainted with his son's handwriting. Mr Hunter quotes Gloucester's words, 'It is his' (I, ii, 66), and suggests that I may have overlooked them. My remark was hardly worth making, but it represented my interpretation of the passage, which runs thus in the Folio:

Glou. You know the character to be your Brothers?
Bast. If the matter were good my Lord, I durst swear it were his: but in respect of that, I would faine thinke it were not.
Glou. It is his.
Bast. It is his hand, my Lord: but I hope his heart is not in the Contents.

I took 'It is his,' following Gloucester's question, to be an instance of his feebleness in allowing himself to be guided by Edmund, a trait strongly marked in this scene. I was not satisfied, however, that the Folio reading is right. Q_1 reads 'It is his?' and Q_2 'Is it his?' and the readings of the Quartos are frequently superior to those of the Folio. I used the words 'appears to be' to show that I did not regard my interpretation, which I still think the most probable, as certain.

[2] *Modern Language Review*, April 1908.

[3] *Modern Language Notes*, February 1908.

bethan type, where the normal method was to borrow from the French. Prof. Kastner himself has done such notable work in the English imitations of Ronsard, Du Bellay, and Desportes[1], that no more need be said. His last article blighted the hopes of my colleague, Mr McCune, who had in manuscript Daniel's indebtedness to Du Bellay. Even here the Italian cannot be ignored. Lodge's sonnet, *Phillis*, XXVIII, 'Not causeless were you christened, gentle flowers,' is a fairly close rendition of Ariosto's fourth sonnet, 'Non senza causa il giglio e l' amaranto.' But the general tendency among Elizabethan writers is markedly towards translation from the French.

On the other hand, when one considers the writers of Tottel, especially Wyatt, not as Elizabethan but as Tudor sonneteers, the same statement does not hold. As yet, aside from Prof. Koeppel's article in *Anglia*[2], to my knowledge not a single French original has been found for the poems of Wyatt, while Italian sources are manifold. Of the two coincidences between Wyatt and Saint-Gelais mentioned by Prof. Koeppel, one, 'Like to these unmesurable montayns,' whatever may be the direct original of the Saint-Gelais, has been discovered by Mr Tilley, Prof. Kastner and myself, three separate times, to be a translation from Sannazaro—Italian, not French. The other, while undoubtedly similar, is yet so different in detail that it suggests rather a common original as yet unknown. The stock of ideas and expressions left in gavelkind by Petrarch was so shared in common[3] that the employment of the same conceit, unless accompanied with close verbal similarity, proves little but a common literary parentage. Wyatt, moreover, normally translates from the beginning[4]. All his poems that have been identified are Italian.

[1] *Athenaeum*, 4017, 4018. [2] Emil Koeppel, *Anglia*, XIII, 77.

[3] Compare the reasoning on pp. 6—7 of Mr Ingraham's *Sources of Les Amours de Jean Antoine de Baif*, Columbus, Ohio, 1905.

[4] As this reasoning applies also to the indebtedness of Wyatt to Seraphino, pointed out by Prof. Koeppel (*Romanische Forschungen*, v, 67), to prove this point I add the first lines of those poems only of which there can be question. The references are to Arber's reprint of Tottel and to Mestica's edition of *Le Rime*.

P. 33: The long love, that in my thought I harbor
Son. 109: Amor, che nel penser mio vive e regna.
P. 33: Yet I was ever of your love agreed
Son. 61: Io non fu' d' amar voi lassato unquanco.
P. 34: The lively sparks, that issue from those eyes
Son. 220: Vive faville uscian de' duo bei lumi.
P. 35: Such vain thought as wonted to mislead me
Son. 136: Pien d' un vago penser, che me desvia.
P. 37: Cesar, what that the traytour of Egypt
Son. 81: Cesare, poiche 'l traditor d' Egitto
P. 38: Some fowles there be, that have so perfect sight
Son. 17: Son animali al mondo de sí altera (vista).
P. 38: Because I still kept thee fro lyes, and blame
Son. 41: Perch' io t' abbia guardato di menzogna.
P. 39: I find no peace, and all my warre is done
Son. 104: Pace non trovo, e non ò da far guerra.
P. 39: My galley is charged with forgetfulnesse
Son. 156: Passa la nave mia colma d' oblio.
P. 40: Avisyng the bright beames of those fair eyes
Son. 140: Mirando 'l Sol de' begli occhi sereno.

The reason for this vast preponderance of Italian influence over the French is shown by a comparison of the dates. There is no question but that Wyatt travelled in both countries. His first visit to France was in 1526, when he was twenty-three years old. The following year he spent in Italy, visiting Venice, Ferrara, Bologna, Florence and Rome[1]. To a man of taste there could be no comparison between the literatures. The Cinquecento was then at its prime. Is it any wonder then that Wyatt fell under the influence of the *Petrarchisti* and brought back with him the Italian manner? This consists in form, of a preference for the sonnet, the ode, the madrigal, rather than the rhyme royal, the couplet, the rondeau; in substance, of platonic idealization expressed by various rhetorical devices. It is possible to have the form alone—as is the case of Clément Marot—or the substance alone—as is the case with Maurice Scève; Wyatt has them both.

Not only was *Petrarchismo* imported into England by Wyatt, but it reached England before it reached France. Again the difficulty lies in the fact that the dates of publication are fallacious because the works circulated in manuscript. Thus although Tottel was not published until 1557, as Wyatt had died in 1542, it is the earlier date only which needs to be considered[2]. The question then narrows down to whether it be possible to find *Petrarchismo* in France written, not printed, before 1540. To answer this a short analysis of French literature before 1550 becomes necessary. It may be discussed under four fairly distinct heads[3].

1. Les grands rhétoriqueurs. 2. Clément Marot and his school. 3. The precursors of the Pléiade. 4. The Pléiade itself. Leaving the first aside, because there can be no question of *Petrarchismo* there, we shall discuss them in the reverse order, considering only those poets who have been considered in this discussion.

With regard to the Pléiade, we are fortunate in having definite

P. 68: Even my hap is slack and slowe in commyng
Son. 44: Mie venture al venir son tarde e pigre.
P. 69: Love, Fortune, and my minde which do remember
Son. 99: Amor, Fortuna et la mia mente, schiva.
P. 69: How oft have I, my deare and cruell fo
Son. 19: Mille fiate, o dolce mia guerrera.
P. 70: Like unto these unmesurable montayns
Sannazaro: Simile à questo smisurati monti. (Pt. 3, son. 3.)
P. 70: If amourous fayth, or if an hart unfained
Son. 188: S' una fede amorosa, un cor non finto.
P. 72: The pillar perisht is whereto I lent
Son. 229: Rotta è l' alta Colonna e 'l verde Lauro.
P. 73: Go burning sighes unto the frosen hart
Son. 120: Ite, caldi sospiri, al freddo core. (First quatrain only.)
P. 73: So feble is the thred, that doth the burden stay
Canz. 4: Si è debile il filo, a cui s' attene (canzone).

Whereas the first five of the eight lines of Wyatt have no similarity with Saint-Gelais.

[1] Proved by a letter from Sir Thomas Cheney, Gairdner, *Domestic Letters and Papers of the Reign of Henry VIII*, IV, 2135.

[2] John Bruce, *Gentleman's Magazine*, 1850, page 258.

[3] This classification follows the general line of manuals of French literature; e.g. Petit de Julleville, Brunetière, Darmesteter, Faguet, and Tilley.

dates. The published work begins with the *Deffense* and *L'Olive* of Du Bellay and the *Erreurs Amoureuses* of Tyard, all three in 1549. M. Marty-Laveaux[1] in his introduction to his edition of the last asserts that this was composed as early as 1543. Granting that, the earliest date assigned to the composition of any of the work of the Pléiade, we have the year after Wyatt's death when Surrey had only four years to live. With Du Bellay we are upon still firmer ground. In the preface to the 1550 edition of the *Olive* he says[2]:

> Voulant donques enrichir nostre vulgaire d'une nouuelle, ou plustost ancienne renouuellée poësie, ie m'adonnay à l'immitation des anciens Latins, & des poëtes Italiens, dont i'ay entendu ce que m'en a peu apprendre la communication familière de mes amis. Ce fut pourquoy, à la persuasion de Iaque Peletier, ie choisi le Sonnet, & l'Ode, deux poëmes de ce temps là (c'est depuis quatre ans) encore peu usitez entre les nostres : étant le Sonnet d'Italien devenu François, comme ie croy, par Mellin de Sainct Gelais....

In 1546, then, at the persuasion of Jacques Peletier du Mans, he began writing sonnets, a form then rarely used and presumably recently introduced by Melin de Saint-Gelais. Ronsard by his own statement in two different places dates his work:

> le vint-uniesme jour
> Du mois d'avril, que je vins au sejour
> De la prison ou les Amours me pleurent[3].

> L'an mil cinq cens, contant quarante six,
> Dans ses cheveux une dame cruelle
> (Ne scais quel plus, las! ou cruelle ou belle)
> Lia mon coeur...[4].

M. Henri Longnon[5] argues that owing to the new style the date here is our 1545. Granting this without argument, we still find a date posterior by three years to Wyatt's death. This is important as, whatever might be the sporadic use of the sonnet, the work of the Pléiade is strictly the analogy of the poetry of the court of Henry VIII. Wyatt's Anne and Surrey's Geraldine are paralleled by Du Bellay's Olive, Ronsard's Cassandre, Tyard's Pasithée, Baïf's Méline, etc. Thus in one sense the case is proved.

But in order to lay to rest for ever this spectre of French precedence, we must now consider that group called loosely, for want of a better name, the precursors of the Pléiade, a group which may be centred at Lyons. There about 1540[6] Margaret of Navarre became attracted to the doctrine of Platonic love. This led easily to *Petrarchismo,* and suggests Maurice Scève. As early as 1533 Scève had brought himself into prominence by his discovery of the pseudo-tomb of Laura at Avignon[7]. But his interest in Petrarch bore apparently no immediate

[1] *Les Œuvres de Pontus de Tyard,* par Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1875.
[2] *Les Œuvres de Joachim Du Bellay,* par Marty-Laveaux, Paris, 1867, vol. i, p. 72.
[3] *Amours,* t. 1, Son. xiv, Blanchemain, Paris, 1867, vol. i, p. 10.
[4] *Ibid.*, Son. cxxvii, p. 71.
[5] Henri Longnon, *Revue des questions historiques,* Jan. 1902.
[6] Arthur Tilley, *Literature of the French Renaissance,* Cambridge, 1904, vol. i, p. 137.
[7] Albert Baur, *Maurice Scève,* Paris 1906, p. 26 et al.

fruit, since in 1535 he published a translation of a Spanish translation of Boccaccio, and in 1538 he entered the *concours* of the 'blazon' series inaugurated by Marot. It is fair to conclude, therefore, that the arrival of Margaret quickened his *Petrarchismo*. In any case it found vent in the *Délie*, 1544. But this differs radically from the sort of work done by both Wyatt and the Pléiade. M. Laumonier, in his commentary on the poems of Peletier, thus disposes of Scève[1]:

Quant à Scève, quoi qu'on pense de son obscurité sybilline, de son symbolisme rébarbatif, de son platonisme alambiqué, qui auraient fait l'admiration des élèves de Dorat, ce n'est pas lui que du Bellay, Ronsard et de Baïf ont suivi; Tyard seul l'a quelquefois imité dans ses *Erreurs* et encore seulement pour le fond. En fait de poésie amoureuse, les sources de Scève sont Charitео, Tebaldeo, Serafino; celles de la Pléiade sont Pétrarque et les pétrarquistes vénitiens, dont le chef est le cardinal Bembo. La Pléiade a en outre suivi tous les poètes de l'antiquité gréco-latine, puis l'Ariosto; on ne peut en dire autant de Scève. Enfin il a écrit sa *Délie* en dizains, forme ordinaire de l'épigramme française antérieure et la plus voisine des *strambotti*, tandis que la Pléiade a adopté, pour chanter l'amour et la beauté, des formes poétiques toutes différentes. Scève me paraît un isolé, et à certains égards un attardé, dans sa cité lyonnaise: son flambeau fumeux n'éclaire pas jusqu'à Paris.

To me the decisive proof of the late date of French *Petrarchismo* is the fact, stated above, that the poems of the *Délie* are dizains, not sonnets; a few years later he would have used the sonnet form. Of the others Louise Labé (b. 1525?)[2] and Magny[3] (b. 1529?) in 1540 were too young to have produced much work. Magny himself is rather a precursor of the later manner of Desportes. Then Peletier only remains. Estienne Pasquier[4], writing in 1560, thus places him:

Jacques Peletier du Mans, qui commença aussi d'habiller nostre Poesie à la nouvelle guise, avecqu'un très heureux succès....Ce fut une belle guerre que l'on entreprit contre l'ignorance, dont j'attribue l'avant-garde à Scève, Bèze, et Peletier; ou si le voulez autrement, ce furent les avant-coureurs des autres poètes.

Bezius is ruled out because he wrote in Latin; Scève, in the passage just quoted; 'reste Peletier.' M. Séché carries the ideas contained in the celebrated epistle 'A un Poete qui n'escrivoit qu'en Latin[5]' only back as far as 1543[6]. If, however, Peletier begins French *Petrarchismo*, and does not begin it until 1543, there is no possibility of his influencing the Tudor poets. We might rest the case here.

But the real question at issue is the question of the *Petrarchismo* of Marot and Saint-Gelais. The extreme position is given by M. Piéri:

Il (Marot) crut même devoir sacrifier au goût du jour; lui si indépendant de caractère, si pétulant de grâce et brillant d'esprit, il se mit sur le tard à pétrarquiser. A l'occasion, il accueille la pointe à l'italienne, le jeu de mots sur le nom de sa

[1] *Œuvres poétiques de Jacque Peletier du Mans*, publiées d'après l'édition originale de 1547 par Léon Séché. Avec une Notice biographique, un Commentaire et des Notes par Paul Laumonier, Paris, 1904, p. 147.

[2] *Œuvres de Louise Labé*, éd. Blanchemain, Paris, 1875.

[3] *Olivier de Magny, Étude Biographique*, par Jules Favre, Paris, 1885.

[4] *Recherches de la France*, 1, VI, chap. 7. Quoted from Laumonier.

[5] Peletier, *ibid.*, p. 110.

[6] Peletier, *ibid.*, p. XIII.

dame (Diane) ou sur Lyon, les métaphores recherchées, les exagérations invraisemblables, les antithèses maniérées, les fadeurs banales ; il nous parlera de neige brûlante et d'un cœur qui quitte sa poitrine pour suivre l'amie. Il se garde seulement du platonisme cher à Pétrarque ; il est plus matériel dans ses amours et il n'aime pas à soupirer sans espoir ; l'attente éternelle sans les réalités, comme disait Tartuffe, n'est pas de son goût ; on aperçoit vite les limites jusqu'où il porte l'adoration platonique. Enfin Marot, tout en conservant sa franchise, ressentit l'influence du *Canzoniere* ; on peut en voir une preuve frappante dans la traduction qu'il fit d'une chanson et de six sonnets de Pétrarque ;...mais il était impossible de ne pas signaler l'influence de Pétrarque sur son facile génie, quoiqu'elle n'ait agi sur lui que tardivement et dans la seconde moitié de sa carrière[1].

I question whether the influence of Petrarch would have received so much stress if the poems had not been read with a knowledge of future events. While exaggerated metaphor, pointed antithesis and punning are certainly marks of *Petrarchismo*, they are equally characteristic of the rhetorical school of which Marot is the legitimate successor. For example the particular epigram cited of the burning snow[2], dated by Lenglet-Dufresnoy 1528[3], is the one chosen by M. Bourciez[4] as an example of his Anacreontic grace. In general, the *fond* of *Petrarchismo*, sentimental platonism, is completely lacking. The total impression is very different. M. Bourciez[5], to interpret his manner to modern readers, compares him to Alfred de Musset, and M. Faguet[6] calls him 'une première épreuve de la Fontaine, manquée, si l'on veut, par comparaison avec l'épreuve définitive, mais déjà intéressante et singulièrement originale.' In fact to see *Petrarchismo* in his epigrams seems to me to deny the historical position of the Pléiade.

That Marot knew Petrarch is an entirely different question. The 'Visions of Petrarch,' the six sonnets translated from the *Canzoniere*, incidental references and an occasional line show that he was familiar with the great Tuscan. It is interesting to note that the translations were not included in the edition, superintended by the author himself, in 1538, but appeared only in the edition of 1545. The assumption therefore, as I cannot find that Lenglet-Dufresnoy has dated them, is that they were composed between those two dates, that is after 1540. Before that time the occasional references show knowledge of Petrarch, but no influence. Of these there are just three. The relationship claimed in

> Petrarque a bien sa maitresse nommée,
> Sans amoindrir sa bonne renommée :
> Donc, si je suis son disciple estimée,
> Craindre ne fault que tu en sois blasmée[7],

disappears on closer examination. His conception is shown by the fact

[1] Marius Piéri, p. 55, *Pétrarque et Ronsard*, Marseilles, 1896.
[2] Epigramme XXIV, *Œuvres de Clément Marot*, éd. Pierre Jannet, Paris, n.d.
[3] Given in Jannet's edition, vol. 4, p. 199.
[4] *Histoire de la Langue et de la Littérature française*, par L. Petit de Julleville, t. 3, Chap. 3, p. 110 by M. Bourciez.
[5] M. Bourciez, *ibid.*, p. 119.
[6] *Seizième Siècle*, par Émile Faguet, Paris, 1898, p. 41.
[7] Epigramme LXI (1527), Jannet, t. 3, p. 27.

that in the two other places he brackets him with authors antithetic in character.

> Pour suivre ainsi Jean de Meun ou Petrarque[1]....
>
> Ovidius, maistre Alain Chartier[2],
> Petrarque, aussi le Roman de la Rose,
> Sont les messelz, breviare et psaultier....

Even the Petrarchan line used as refrain,

> Desbender l'arc, ne guerist point la playe[3],

since it was the motto of King René, and he may have seen it at Nantes, shows no necessary knowledge of the original. This position is also substantiated by the two poems written to celebrate the discovery of the tomb of Laura. The epitaph, attributed also to the King,

> En petit lieu comprins vous pouvez voir[4]...,

and the occasional poem,

> O Laure, Laure, il t'a esté besoing[5]...,

are frankly what they pretend to be, epigrams. On the other hand, while the manner is undoubtedly absent, there is virtual agreement that Marot introduced the sonnet form. 'Pour le may planté par les imprimeurs de Lyon[6]' is the first dated French sonnet. 'A. M. L. D. D. F. luy estant en Italie[7],' written probably in 1536, shows some of the Petrarchan manner. The *Sonnet de l'auteur*[8] is not even a regular sonnet. But in general, however regular the form, the matter is epigrammatic. This seems to sustain M. Jabinski[9] that the sonnet was first known in France as a form of epigram. Then here there can be no question of the priority of the English poets.

Of the French poets Melin de Saint-Gelais remains to be discussed, Marot's contemporary, rival and disciple, who, born eight years before him, yet survived him fourteen years. And it is Saint-Gelais that, on the authority of the passage already quoted from the preface to the *Olive* is said to have introduced the sonnet form into France. Here, however, the ground becomes very slippery owing to an almost entire absence of definite dates. According to the testimony of Du Bellay probably, and certainly of Magny, he was reluctant to print his work[10]. His first volume, published as late as 1547, exists in a single copy—a condition which suggests that perhaps the edition was suppressed[11]. In this volume the only sonnet, 'Voyant ces monts de veue ainsi lointaine,' is the one which has excited this controversy. The only passage taken from the Italian noted by Blanchemain is a rendition in *terza rima* of Bembo's, 'Amor è, donne care, un vano e fello[12].' If we

[1] Jannet, t. 2, p. 59.
[2] *Temple de Cupidon*, *ibid.*, t. 1, p. 18.
[3] *Ibid*, t. 2, p. 95.
[4] *Ibid.*, t. 3, p. 152.
[5] *Ibid.*, t. 3, p. 39.
[6] *Ibid.*, t. 3, p. 59.
[7] *Ibid.*, t. 3, p. 76.
[8] *Ibid.*, t. 1, p. 116.
[9] Reviewed by M. Henri Potez, *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1904, p. 341.
[10] *Œuvres de Melin de Sainct-Gelays*, par Prosper Blanchemain, Paris, 1873, t. 1, p. 11.
[11] *Ibid.*, t. 1, p. 14 note; also t. 1, p. 33.
[12] *Ibid.*, t. 1, p. 69.

could assume that this volume contained all his work up to that time, the question would be answered. Unfortunately this assumption is contrary to the fact. In the second (1574) edition, sonnet VIII is dated 1544[1]; the sonnet to Clément Marot (if it be addressed to Clément Marot) addresses him as still alive[2]: and sonnet VI, 'mis au Pétrarque de feu Monsieur le Duc d'Orléans[3],' is presumably anterior to that date. Thus for some reason only a part of his work, already written, was published in 1547.

Then the question arises, how long before that date did his poems circulate in manuscript? M. Piéri answers:

> Vers 1547, Melin de Saint-Gelais faisait paraître un recueil de poésies renfermant quelques sonnets qu'il avait composés à l'imitation des Italiens et qui, depuis plus de dix ans, circulaient de main en main[4].

This statement, while apparently authoritative, becomes doubtful on examination. In the first place there are not 'quelques sonnets.' There is only one. In the second place, the 'plus de dix ans' was apparently suggested by the date 1536 affixed to that sonnet by Blanchemain from internal evidence. As it has been proved to be a translation, that date is no longer supported, even by guesswork. This point is also discussed by M. Vaganay in his *Le Sonnet au XVI^e Siècle*[5]:

> En France, les ballades de Villon ne laissèrent point prévoir quelles seraient les formes préférées de l'âge suivant et Marot lui-même, bien qu'un sonnet se réfère à un événement de 1529, ne se doute nullement qu'il fût un précurseur: ce dernier terme n'est point tout à fait exact, et M. A. Darmesteter a montré que Mellin de Saint-Gelais avait visité l'Italie avant Marot et que ses sonnets 'présentent dans le dernier tercet la rime florentine (ede) propre aux sonnets italiens,' lorsque 'Marot dispose le dernier tercet en :dee, groupement qui a été généralement adopté par nos poètes.'

I quote this in full as, since M. Vaganay gives no reference, I have been unable to locate the reference in the various publications of M. Arsène Darmesteter, or in the various critical reviews. I regret this all the more since my own investigations lead to a diametrically opposite conclusion. Of the nineteen sonnets given in the edition of Blanchemain, the same edition to which M. Darmesteter refers in his *Seizième Siècle*, not one has the last tercet rhyming (ede). The only exception is the irregular sonnet, t. 1, p. 284, whose entire rhyming scheme is ababbccddeefef. To make the matter more astounding, in 'Pour le may, A. M. L. D. D. F.,' and the six sonnets from Petrarch, Marot never uses the form dee. Nor is there any such general agreement among the Florentines as seems to be intimated. The whole passage is inexplicable! Thus I am thrown back upon my own resources.

In the case of Saint-Gelais, as in the case of Marot, there is a satiric attitude of mind antagonistic to the sentimentality of *Petrarchismo*, the French love of *esprit*. He is considered, rightly I think, to uphold the

[1] Blanchemain, t. 1, p. 290.
[2] *Ibid.*, t. 2, p. 262.
[3] *Ibid.*, t. 1, p. 287.
[4] Piéri, *ibid.*, p. 52.
[5] *Le Sonnet en Italie et en France au XVI^e Siècle*, par Hugues Vaganay, Lyon, 1902. Fascicule 11 (1903), p. vi.

old tradition. Otherwise I cannot see the reason for the celebrated quarrel between him and Ronsard, between the old school and the new. If the work of the Pléiade, instead of being different in kind, was merely an extension of the *Petrarchismo* found in Saint-Gelais, he certainly would not have provoked that scene at Court, nor would there have been on their part any attack upon his work. Rather at a time when the new manner was on trial, they would have leaned on his support. After the reconciliation, however, it would be natural for the older poet, particularly a man so facile in genius as Saint-Gelais, to imitate the popular fashion. *A priori* the *Petrarchismo* to be found in the later editions of Saint-Gelais may be inferred to have been written after the success of the Pléiade and in imitation of it. If this be true, then Wyatt's priority is settled.

In fact, as I see it, it is precisely because of the popularity of the type represented by the poems of Marot and Saint-Gelais, that the coming of *Petrarchismo* was retarded in France. In England, on the contrary, during the reign of Henry VIII the elaborate court life developed conditions demanding courtly poetry simultaneously with the disappearance of the English models, owing to the neglect in pronunciation of the final *e*, suitable for those occasions. Skelton was not sufficiently refined, Heywood was dull and the Chaucerian imitators naturally unable to follow their master. Even Chaucer was felt to be antiquated.

> At those days moch commended,
> And now men wold haue amended
> His Englysh, whereat they barke,
> And mar all they warke[1].

Consequently when Wyatt, finding the conventional solution among the Italian courts, brought the sonnet back to England, it spread with almost no resistance. In France, on the contrary, the old manner was represented by so powerful a body as Clement Marot and his friends. To introduce it in spite of his influence caused a literary revolution. Hence the vast importance of the *Deffense*. 'In no other country of Europe is the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance so clearly marked as it is in France by this single book[2].' It won because little by little, as we have seen, the outworks had been gained. The change was in the air; even Marot had tampered with Petrarch. Consequently what is more probable than that, when Wyatt was in France on his diplomatic expeditions, he met Saint-Gelais at the Court and showed him his work? As an indication of this, it is suggestive that five of the nineteen regular sonnets written by Saint-Gelais terminate in a couplet, two of the five certainly having been written before 1547. Of the two hundred and twenty-two sonnets in the first book of the *Amours* of Ronsard, who found his inspiration truly in Italy, not one

[1] Dyce's edition of Skelton; *Phyllyp Sparowe*, lines 796–9.

[2] *History of Literary Criticism in the Renaissance*, by J. E. Spingarn, New York, 1899, p. 172.

terminates in a couplet. M. Vianey[1], noticing this, credits it to the example of Peletier. He does use the couplet, but only twice. But the couplet ending is the normal ending in Wyatt. It is a fair supposition, then, that the two court poets exchanged notes, that Saint-Gelais remarked the English method, and that he went even so far as to translate a whole sonnet. Although this is not susceptible of positive proof, I respectfully argue that it is not '*a priori* highly improbable.'

JOHN M. BERDAN.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., U.S.A.

I have read Mr Berdan's discussion of 'Wyatt and the French Sonneteers,' and must confess that I remain irretrievably impenitent. His assumption, which in the original (*Modern Language Notes*, February 1908) comes very near being a conviction, appears to me to be quite untenable. No one would have been more pleased than myself if Mr Berdan had succeeded in proving his startling proposition, and thus establishing a most interesting phenomenon in the literary relations between France and England in the sixteenth century.

The real point at issue, to which I will confine myself for the present, is that I deny Mr Berdan's thesis that Melin de Saint-Gelais translated the sonnet 'Voyant ces monts de veue ainsi lointaine' from Wyatt's 'Like unto these unmeasurable mountains,' and that I do not even admit that there is any probability that the French poet's model was Wyatt. It is not only the weakness of Mr Berdan's arguments and the errors into which he lapses—in spite of his evident erudition—that invalidate his case, but the strength of the facts, and the deductions from those facts, on the other side. Rectifying an error into which Emil Koeppel (*Anglia*, XIII, 77-8) had fallen through not being aware of the existence of the original Italian source, I have already stated my conviction—a conviction which I believe is shared by all recent investigators—that both the sonnet of Saint-Gelais and that of Wyatt are modelled on the sonnet of Sannazaro 'Simile a questi smisurati monti' which appeared in print for the first time in 1531 apparently (*Modern Language Review*, April 1908). Wyatt's sonnet is an almost verbatim translation of that of his Italian predecessor; the version of Saint-Gelais is a freer rendering though it cannot be said to depart to any considerable extent from the Italian prototype. Mr Berdan admits that Wyatt's reproduction is a translation from Sannazaro, and that he probably came across the Italian original during his stay at Rome in 1527. But Saint-Gelais also went to Italy, at a somewhat earlier date, to complete his studies, first to Padua, and in 1509 to Bologna, where he appears to have remained till after the beginning of the reign of Francis I. Moreover the character of much of his work affords ample testimony that he too

[1] M. J. Vianey, *Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France*, 1904, p. 307.

had not been able to resist the charms and attraction of Italian literature. These considerations, taken in conjunction with the dominating facts that English poetry was absolutely unknown in France at the time, and that Italy was the common storehouse for French, English and Spanish poets (especially sonneteers) in the sixteenth century, ought to be sufficient to dispose of Mr Berdan's theory. However, I am anxious to meet him on his chosen ground, and hope to be able to show in detail that his arguments rest on an unsound basis.

Mr Berdan states that Saint-Gelais is 'considered to uphold the old tradition.' This assertion will not withstand scrutiny, and in his earlier manner at all events he is almost wholly dominated by Italian influence. Both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais are Italianates, but whereas Wyatt frequently follows the Petrarchists, preferably the great master himself, Saint-Gelais was above all, both in form and substance, a disciple of the Quattrocento[1]; a large number of his huitains and dizains are evidently inspired by the strambotti of Serafino, and one of them is actually a translation of a strambotto of the poet of Aquila. Yet he did not altogether eschew Petrarchism proper. Wyatt also, in spite of his translations from Petrarch, likewise felt the influence of the Quattrocento to a marked degree, though it cannot be denied that he was a much more thorough-going Petrarchist than Saint-Gelais. The numerous translations and adaptations from Serafino in Wyatt's work prove this. In choosing the sonnet in question from among those of Sannazaro rather than any other both Wyatt and Saint-Gelais remained true to one side at least of their natural bent. Its exaggerated metaphors and strained hyperboles single it out from the rest of Sannazaro's sonnets. Serafino, Tebaldeo, or Pamfilo Sasso, that apt pupil of theirs, might have written it[2]. The central idea is identically the same as in the following strambotto of Serafino:

> Quanto e piu alto un monte ha piu le neve,
> Il pian dal sol piu longe ha piu calore.
> Di questo ogn' un maravigliar se deve,
> Ma tu non gia, che in me tel mostra amore:
> Son da te longe, il cor foco riceve:
> Te son d' apresso, a l' hor tremando more.
> Cosi amor mostra nel mio cor doglioso
> Quel che in natura par miraculoso[3].

Though I do not wish to exaggerate the importance of what may only be a coincidence, it almost looks as if Sannazaro who was friendly with Cariteo, the precursor of the group, and with Tebaldeo, had one day wished to show his friends that he could, if he so desired, hold his own

[1] J. Vianey proves this convincingly in his article on *L'Influence italienne chez les précurseurs de la Pléiade* (*Bulletin italien*, avril—juin 1903).

[2] It is interesting to note in this connection that, as early as 1816, Dr Nott (than whom there was no better judge of Italian literature in his time) was struck by the resemblance Wyatt's translation bore to the manner of the Quattrocento. Not aware of the Italian original, he speaks of Wyatt's performance as 'probably borrowed from some Italian writer, Tibaldeo or Accolti' (*Works of Sir Thomas Wyatt*, London, 1816, p. 543).

[3] Quoted according to the Venice edition of 1548, p. 142.

with them on their own ground. There were special reasons why this particular sonnet of Sannazaro should have appealed to Saint-Gelais and to Wyatt, both disciples of Serafino and his associates. Thus the question becomes not so much one of Petrarchism as of Quattrocentism, if I may be allowed that ugly word, and Mr Berdan's main argument and the shaky edifice constructed upon it fall to the ground. His second argument which he does well, I think, to keep in the background is still more hopeless. Mr Berdan thinks that another way of establishing the probability of his proposition would be to cite 'the few other borrowings in the French from the English—as is notably the case of Chaucer—by showing that the English language was understood at the Court of France—a condition which is historically probable.' To hark back to Chaucer is hardly relevant. His influence on French poetry of any time is highly problematical and in any case infinitesimal. As for the borrowings of the French from the English in the sixteenth century I confess I am not acquainted with them. All the evidence points the other way. In fact English vernacular literature in the sixteenth century might not have existed as far as the French poets were concerned. This affirmation I know is a truism, but perhaps I may be allowed to instance a few striking examples that may not be present in everybody's mind. In spite of a three years' stay in Scotland and England there is not the slightest trace of the influence of English literature in the works of Ronsard. The visit of Du Bartas to the English and Scottish courts and his very cordial reception by the king and poet James VI did not bear any more fruit. The same may be said of Jacques Grévin's visit, and when in later years Brantôme, a keen observer, if ever there was one, came to record the reminiscences of his chequered career, the one event of his stay in England which he recalls with the greatest pleasure and vividness was the unexpected encounter in the Tower of the descendants of certain dogs, six in number, four of them being bitches, which his father, the Seigneur de Bourdeille, had once presented to Henry VIII. On English poets he is mute. He remembered only the dogs. This extraordinary neglect of English literature was general and lasting; from the day that old Deschamps wrote his now famous compliment to Geoffrey Chaucer till Du Bartas included Sir Philip Sidney in his enumeration of the chief supporters of the principal modern languages (II *Jour de la* II *Sepmaine*, l. 605) there does not appear to be any mention of the name of any English poet in the annals of French literature. It were easy to go on accumulating proofs of the same kind, if one were not anxious to avoid repeating what has been much better said by others[1]. Not only the literature but also the language of England was looked upon as crude and in many respects barbarous. A few people at court may have had a smattering of English, but there is no evidence to show that any Frenchmen, excepting a few merchants who had direct and frequent business relations with England, had any

[1] Compare in particular M. Jusserand's article in the *Nineteenth Century*, April 1898, on *French Ignorance of English Literature in Tudor Times*—an eloquent title in itself.

knowledge of the language. It was not taught. What likelihood then is there that Saint-Gelais who had never set foot on English soil was able to read Wyatt? How and where would he have come by any knowledge of English? Whatever way Mr Berdan's theory is looked at, it appears to me that the epithet I applied to it and of which he complains errs on the side of mildness. It would be truer to facts to say that his theory is impossible. Against this overwhelming array of hostile forces Mr Berdan's only hope was to advance positive proofs to the contrary. If he had been able to demonstrate, for example, that the phraseology and turns of Wyatt's sonnet were closely reproduced by Saint-Gelais, he would have gone a long way to prove his case. This he cannot do. Even then it would have been essential to prove that Wyatt's sonnet was written before that of Saint-Gelais. This also he cannot do. Instead he accumulates a farrago of facts which have little or nothing to do with the case, interspersed with erroneous assertions of his own, a few of which I will now proceed to correct.

In reference to the contents of Mr Berdan's second paragraph I have explicitly pointed out the danger of ignoring the Italian original in considering the source of Elizabethan sonnets. That is the whole point of my emphasising the indebtedness of Saint-Gelais to Sannazaro in my article on *The Elizabethan Sonneteers and the French Poets* (*Modern Language Review*, April 1908). Mr Berdan is also unaware apparently that I have already drawn attention to the Italian source of *Phillis* XXVIII, and devoted another article in the same periodical (January 1907) to Lodge's dependence on the Italians. To say (in his fourth paragraph) that the Cinquecento was at its height when Wyatt visited Italy in 1527 is scarcely accurate. The *Rime* of Sannazaro and of Bembo, the two principal poets who reacted against the Quattrocento, were not published till 1530, though they were undoubtedly in circulation before that date. The Quattrocento was still vigorous at that date, as is shown by the numerous editions of Serafino which succeeded each other rapidly till 1550[1]. Further on Mr Berdan, brushing aside unceremoniously the pioneer work of the precursors of the Pléiade, makes the rash assertion that 'whatever might be the sporadic use of the sonnet, the work of the Pléiade is strictly the analogy of the poetry of the court of Henry VIII. Wyatt's Anne and Surrey's Geraldine are paralleled by Du Bellay's Olive, Ronsard's Cassandre, Tyard's Pasithée, Baïf's Méline, etc.' Not to mention the lack of all sense of proportion, I should have said that the parallel is to be found roughly in the extraordinary outburst of sonneteering led by Thomas Watson, Sidney and Spenser. Moreover the custom of grouping sonnets under the fanciful name of some mistress was unknown to the poets of Tottel's *Miscellany*, so that here again Mr Berdan is stretching a point. Overlooking numerous errors of fact or judgment, more particularly in the estimation of the part played by those poets who pointed the way to the

[1] See the introduction to Vol. I (the only one to appear so far) of Menghini's *Le Rime di Serafino de' Ciminelli dall' Aquila*, Bologna, 1894.

Pléiade, we come to this equally audacious declaration: 'while the manner is undoubtedly absent, there is virtual agreement that Marot introduced the sonnet form.' It is impossible to prove categorically that the distinction of importing the sonnet belongs to Saint-Gelais and not to Marot, but considering that Du Bellay expresses it as his opinion that he did so, and considering also Saint-Gelais' residence in Italy and fondness for Italian models the benefit of the doubt remains with Saint-Gelais. There is nothing to contradict Du Bellay's statement, and recent criticism is inclined to confirm it[1]. Lastly there is one more statement that cannot be allowed to pass unchallenged. Speaking of the new start made by Wyatt in the art which he practised, Mr Berdan, after characterising the poetry and conditions that immediately preceded, adds: 'consequently when Wyatt, finding the conventional solution among the Italian courts, brought the sonnet back to England, it spread with almost no resistance.' Now this is just what did not happen. 'The result in fact' of Tottel's *Miscellany*, says Professor Saintsbury[2], 'may have been certain but it was not immediate, being delayed for nearly a quarter of a century; and the next remarkable piece of work done in English poetry after the *Miscellany* was in the old forms, and showed little, if any, of the influence of the new poetical learning.' It is true that Mr Berdan is not very explicit and that he may be referring to the contents of the *Miscellany*, in which case Surrey alone enters into consideration. This generous interpretation would not lend much greater appropriateness to Mr Berdan's pronouncement.

L. E. Kastner.

Aberystwyth.

[1] Compare for example A. Tilley, *The Literature of the French Renaissance*, Vol. I, p. 147.
[2] *A History of Elizabethan Literature*, London, 1903, p. 11.

REVIEWS.

La Quaestio de Aqua et Terra di Dante Alighieri. Bibliografia. Dissertazione critica sull' autenticità. Testo e commento. Lessigrafia. Facsimili. Da VINCENZO BIAGI. Modena: G. T. Vincenzi e Nipoti. 1908. 8vo. 195 pp.

The general position of the controversy as to the authenticity of the *Quaestio de Aqua et Terra* is presumably fairly well known to Dante students, but it may be convenient to restate it briefly. The *Quaestio* was printed in 1508, before the *Vita Nuova*, or any other of Dante's minor works except the *Convivio*. The editor was a certain Padre Moncetti, who was active in various ways at that period, but of whom we know nothing that inspires us with any confidence. No one had ever heard of the treatise, for it is mentioned by none of Dante's contemporaries or biographers, and no manuscript of it is known to exist. The question of its authenticity, therefore, must be decided entirely on internal evidence. In uncritical ages the treatise was accepted without question. In the hyper-sceptical age, of which Scartazzini was the best known apostle, its authenticity was generally rejected, though on patently inadequate grounds. But in 1899 the tide was turned by Dr Moore's essay in his second series of *Studies*, in which a strong, if not a conclusive, case was made out for Dante's authorship. Since then there has been an active controversy on the subject, and it has become very clear that Moncetti himself was utterly incapable of forging the treatise, as he was at one time supposed to have done; that it must really have been printed or edited, as it professed to be, from a manuscript, because the contractions were often erroneously expanded; that the question it deals with (whether any portions of the ocean are higher than portions of the land) was under lively discussion during the whole period, from the early fourteenth to the early sixteenth century, over which the controversy as to its authorship ranges; and that the greater part of the arguments on either side might easily have been used at any time during that period. To this I think we may fairly add (though the statements might be challenged) that every attempt to identify a fifteenth or sixteenth century forger has absolutely failed; that the whole style of treatment is worthy of Dante; and that the coincidences of expression and usage which it presents with his acknowledged works are so striking as to raise a strong presumption of

authenticity, unless conclusive objections can be urged. It will be seen, however, that the evidence in favour of the authenticity is purely internal, and cannot, in the nature of the case, be absolutely conclusive. The *argumentum e silentio* is strong against the authenticity, but that argument is proverbially inconclusive. If therefore the authenticity is to be effectively impugned, it must be by demonstrating that the treatise shews acquaintance with facts or arguments that were inaccessible to Dante,—in itself a difficult task, for it involves proving a negative.

I may perhaps best shew the great value of the contributions to the controversy made by Dr Vincenzo Biagi in the handsome volume under review, by enumerating the special points which appeared to me to remain for future discussion when I translated and annotated the treatise in 1904. I pointed out that, in arguing against the theory that the natural centre of water is different from that of earth, Dante says that, if it were so, the line along which a clod of earth and a drop of water fall would be different, which he regards as a *reductio ad absurdum*, § 12; and, I added, 'It is odd that the believers in the late date of the treatise have not, so far as I know, fastened upon this passage as containing ideas beyond the scope of Dante's science.' I was not then aware that in the two preceding years, 1902 and 1903, Dr Boffito had contributed two 'Memorie' to the Royal Academy of Science of Turin, in which, with immense though defective erudition, he had attempted to shew that the arguments in the treatise *pro* and *contra* belonged to the fifteenth rather than the fourteenth century. The specific point to which I called attention was treated by him at great length; and he shewed that Paul, Bishop of Burgos, who supplemented Nicholas de Lyra's *Postilla* in the fifteenth century, had argued that when God separated the land from the water he did so by making the centre of the sphere of water eccentric with respect to that of earth, in which case, of course, some portions of water might be higher as measured from the centre of the earth than some portions of the land. And in the same century Matthew Dornick (who had been the Franciscan minister of the Province of Saxony), defending Nicholas against Paul's criticism, specifically declared against his theory of the eccentricity of water: 'quia sic ordo elementorum à prima creatione institutus, & inclinatio naturalis ad centrum universi omnibus elementis indita, secundum beatum Augustinum, & ipsummet Burgensem, citò cessassent': Biagi, however, is able to produce a passage quite as much to the purpose from Averroes: 'Aqua enim naturaliter non moveretur ad centrum totius, nisi.....esset locus naturalis aquae idem cum loco terrae naturali.' *De coel. et m.*, II, tex., com. 31. And moreover, the cumulative effect of Biagi's other citations is such as to convince us that this special argument was well within the range of a mind like Dante's, even if it had never been specifically indicated before.

The other difficulties I had suggested were of an opposite character, for there are two errors in the treatise which it seems hardly likely

Dante would fall into. In a corrupt and difficult passage towards the close of the treatise (§ 20), the author bases an argument on the supposition that the moon is always south of the equator when she is in perigee. This is an elementary blunder, but I argued that it was of such a nature that it was possible, though not probable, that Dante might make it, and added: 'Could it then be shewn (though I am not aware that it can) that there was in Dante's time a semi-popular idea that the moon was always south of the equator in perigee, I do not think we could be quite confident that Dante's scientific knowledge would enable him to reject it. Nevertheless such a blunder, if not inconceivable, would remain very strange and unexpected.' Now Biagi refers to a passage in which Pliny says of the tides: 'Eadem [Luna] Aquilonia, et a terris longius recedente, mitiores quam cum, in austros digressa, propiore nisu vim suam exercet' (*Nat. Hist.*, II, 97 [99]). This is entirely to the purpose; and moreover Biagi declares that a figure in the Laurentian manuscript of Andalò del Negro indicates (though it seems difficult to understand how it can prove) that the theory was current in Dante's time. The other point which appeared to me to require explanation occurs in § 19. The author treats the portion of a sphere intercepted between two great circles as shaped like a half-moon, that is to say, as unsymmetrical; whereas Fazio Degli Uberti knew better, and described such a figure symmetrically as 'almond-shaped.' This point seems to have escaped Dr Biagi's notice.

It results, then, that out of the three points, important to the controversy, on which I asked for light in 1904, Dr Biagi has illustrated two, and those two by far the most important.

Of less direct bearing on the disputed question, but of importance from the commentator's point of view, is another matter. The treatise twice quotes Averroes. In both places the references given are incorrect, and, so far as I am aware, the passages had never been tracked to their real sources. Both are given as part of the argument urged by the adversary, so that the author is not directly responsible in either case for the accuracy of the reference; and his treatment of a false ascription of opinion to Aristotle elsewhere in the treatise warrants us in supposing that he may have quoted his adversary, references and all, without concerning himself to correct his inaccuracies, though subsequently refuting his arguments. It remains, however, a matter of interest to track the quotations if possible. Dr Biagi enables us to do so in both cases, though here we find striking examples of his weakness as well as of his strength. The first passage occurs in § 5, in which the adversaries allege: 'Omnis opinio quae contradicit sensui, est mala opinio,' and cite as their authority, 'commentatorem super tertio De Anima,' on which I noted in 1904 that no passage of Averroes in his commentary on the Third Book had been found to justify this appeal. Biagi refers us to the place 'dove Aristotile dice: *sensus enim proprie quidem est verus..... De Anim.*, III, tex. 161.' The reference is wrong. The III should be II, for this part of the treatise falls into the second book according to the divisions of the text commented on

by Averroes. In II, 161, then, and also in II, 152, we find the Aristotelian text, but not the comment we are in search of, nor anything that will do as a substitute. But in illustrating the substance of the paragraph, Biagi incidentally quotes from Averroes the very words we want: 'Omnis opinio cui contradicit sensus non est bona opinio.....quod apparet sensui est testimonium illius quod apparet rationi,' and gives as his reference, *Phys.*, VIII, text, et com. 65. But again the reference is wrong; for on looking it up we find indeed the latter part of the quotation, but not the former, which is just the part we want. Being put on the track however we may find it, not where we are told to look for it but some way back in section 26. Biagi, therefore, while putting us on the track, at the same time misdirects us.

The second reference to Averroes occurs in § 18, in which the authority of the commentator in the *De Substantia Orbis* is cited for the dictum: 'omnes formae, quae sunt in potentia materiae idealiter, sunt in actu in motore coeli,' on which I noted in 1904: 'No such passage has been found in the *De Substantia Orbis*, and indeed it is not couched in the phraseology of that treatise.' Biagi again attempts to justify the reference, for he quotes with apparent satisfaction a number of passages from the *De Substantia Orbis*, and from a commentary upon it by Giov. de Janduno, which are little to the purpose; but in the midst of them he gives, as a quotation not from Averroes but from Aristotle (*Met.*, XII, tex. 18), exactly what we want: 'Formae omnes et proportiones sunt in potentia in prima materia, et in actu in primo motore.' Now the passage does not occur in Aristotle at all. It is not in the text, but at the end of the long commentary by Averroes; so that Biagi, while really giving us Averroes whom we want, tells us that he is giving us Aristotle whom we do not want, and almost buries the passage in a number of irrelevances. Surely it is by a strange fatality that in both these instances Dr Biagi makes a vain show of justifying false references in his author, and in incidentally showing us how to correct them involves us in a perfect labyrinth of false references of his own. But it remains true that, in fine, he has enabled us to identify the passages. In other cases I have found his references fairly correct.

Turning to more general considerations, it may be said that a conspicuous fault in Dr Biagi's book is his tendency to mar his extremely strong case by representing it as still stronger than it is. He descends to outrageous interpretations of Dante's own words in the *Comedy* or in the *Eclogues*, in order to remove some semblance of alleged contradiction; and, generally speaking, he will not allow any argument of his opponents to have any validity, however slight. His carelessness in the spelling of foreign names is indicative of the same kind of general looseness, which the references to Averroes reveal.

But for all that, it is not easy to exaggerate the importance of the service Dr Biagi has rendered us. In the face of all the evidence he has collected it seems impossible any longer to maintain that Dante cannot have written the *De Aqua et Terra*. We must further thank

him for the interesting light he has thrown on the state of knowledge and opinion on all cosmographical matters in Dante's time. It is to be noted particularly that he has taken his drag-net not only through the great oceans of Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas and Averroes, but also through many lesser, obscurer, and more inaccessible seas of medieval learning.

PHILIP H. WICKSTEED.

CHILDREY, BERKS.

The Life of Lazarillo de Tormes. His Fortunes and Adversities. Translated from the edition of 1554 (*printed at Burgos*). With a notice of the Mendoza family, a short life of the author, Don Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, a notice of the work, and some remarks on the character of Lazarillo de Tormes. By SIR CLEMENTS MARKHAM. London: A. and C. Black, 1908. 8vo. xxxvi + 106 pp.

This is a very disappointing publication. The actual translation of the text, though it lacks the careless grace of David Rowland's sixteenth century version, is faithful and readable; but the introductory matter is disfigured by eccentricities of appreciation, and by serious errors which imply either carelessness or an insufficient acquaintance with the elementary facts of political and literary history. A few examples must suffice. It is surprising to read that Pedro González Hurtado de Mendoza 'was with Juan I, of Castille, at the battle of Aljubarrota. In the flight the King's horse was killed. Mendoza dismounted and said to the King:

El cavallo vos han muerto,
Subid Rey en mi cavallo.

The King rode away. Mendoza was overtaken and slain. The date of the battle was August 14, 1385. His father survived him, dying in 1405.'

It is true that Mendoza was killed at Aljubarrota, but the story of his offering his horse to the defeated King is altogether unhistorical. There is no evidence to support it, and General Crispín Ximénez de Sandoval, the author of a scholarly treatise on the battle of Aljubarrota, is strongly of opinion that this romantic incident was invented much later—suggested by similar legends concerning Alfonso III and Bernardo del Carpio at Benavente, and Alfonso VI and Rodrigo Cisneros at La Sagra. As to the *romance* quoted above, it may be noted that the opening half-line has been lopped of a syllable, the correct form being

Si el cavallo vos han muerto.

However, the important point is that the *romance* in question was written by the dramatist Alfonso Hurtado de Velarde towards the end of the sixteenth century, and cannot therefore have been quoted two hundred years earlier.

The account of later representatives of the Mendoza family contains many mistakes. It is incorrect to say (p. xvii) that the Marqués de Santillana 'was born in 1396': it is well established that this celebrated personage was born on August 19, 1398. Nor was he 'born in the Asturias' (p. xvii): his birthplace was Carrión de las Condes, which is in Castile. Again, the statement that Santillana 'died in 1454' is erroneous: he died at Guadalajara on March 25, 1458. The references to Santillana's work are not much more satisfactory than the sketch of his biography. 'Among his writings,' we read, 'was a little *Serranilla*': and this is followed by twelve lines, to which a translation is appended. This arrangement is misleading. A reader unfamiliar with Santillana's poems might easily imagine that he had before him the complete text of a unique composition by the author. This is not so. Santillana wrote at least ten *serranillas*; the poem quoted here really consists of fifty-two lines, of which only the first and third stanzas are given, the latter being divided arbitrarily into two quatrains. It is impossible to justify this presentation of a famous classic text, and few students will accept the subsequent statement (p. xviii) that Santillana's 'chief poetical work...was the *Comedieta de Ponza*.' All competent critics are practically unanimous in giving the first place to Santillana's *serranillas*, and next in merit come the *Doctrinal de privados* and *Bias contra Fortuna*.

The biographical sketch of Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, to whom the translator ascribes *Lazarillo de Tormes*, leaves much to desire. 'While he was a student at Salamanca,' we are informed, 'Don Diego wrote *Lazarillo de Tormes*' (p. xxiv). On the face of it, this does not seem likely. Mendoza was then studying for the Church, and it is in the highest degree improbable that anyone in his position would write the compromising satire on 'the most shameless and impudent distributor' of Papal Indulgences, who was Lazarillo's fifth master. A letter from Mendoza to Charles V, dated May 2, 1547, clearly shows that, almost up to that date, the writer was habitually dressed as an ecclesiastic: '...para estorbar muchas esperanzas que se tenian en mi clerecia...me he puesto habito de lego.' In Sir Clements Markham's narrative there is no mention whatever of Mendoza's embassy to England in 1537 to negotiate (1) the marriage of Henry VIII with Charles V's niece, Dorothea, Duchess of Milan, and (2) the marriage of Mary Tudor with Prince Louis of Portugal: particulars will be found in the *Calendar of State Papers, Henry VIII*, vol. XIII, parts i and ii, and in the Spanish *State Papers* of this date (1537–1538), edited by Pascual de Gayangos. The editor of the present volume has neglected to consult these sources, as well as the incomplete but useful study of Fesenmaier, published at Munich in 1882. Not a word is said as to Mendoza's passages of arms with Paul III, and a wrong impression is conveyed by the assertion that 'he was not appreciated by Philip II and seldom came to Court, living, with his splendid library, in his house at Granada' (p. xxiv). Nobody would gather from this bald statement that Mendoza had been exiled to Granada in disgrace, and that there is a sharp debate as

to whether he was disgraced in consequence of irregularities in the accounts rendered of his stewardship at Siena, or whether his exile was due to his having quarrelled with, and assaulted, a certain Diego de Leiva in the Royal Palace during the summer of 1568.

Bibliography fares no better than biography, so far as Diego Hurtado de Mendoza is concerned[1]. With respect to his *Guerra de Granada*, it is asserted that 'the first edition appeared in 1610, and the second real complete edition at Valencia in 1776.' This is altogether wrong, and it is unfortunate that Sir Clements Markham should not have taken the trouble to read M. Foulché-Delbosc's study in the first volume of the *Revue hispanique*, which appeared fourteen years ago. Mendoza's poems were published in 1610; but the first edition of his *Guerra de Granada* did not appear till 1627 when it was issued at Lisbon by Luis Tribaldos de Toledo: the supposititious edition of 1610 has never been seen by anybody, and has nothing to support it but an erroneous entry in Nicolás Antonio's *Bibliotheca Hispana*. Nor is it accurate to say that the second edition of the *Guerra de Granada* was published at Valencia in 1776. The second edition of this work was issued at Madrid in 1674, the third at Valencia about 1730, the fourth at Valencia in 1766: the edition published at Valencia in 1776 is the fifth, and the additional passages inserted in Books III and IV are reprinted from Juan de Iriarte's *Regiæ Bibliothecæ Matritensis codices græci MSS.* published at Madrid in 1769. As to the questions whether we have Mendoza's text in its entirety, or whether all the existing text is the work of Mendoza, the reader cannot do better than refer to M. Foulché-Delbosc's illuminating study. The problem is not discussed in the present volume; there is perhaps no good reason why it should be, unless indeed Sir Clements Markham be justified in attributing *Lazarillo de Tormes* to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza. In that case the examination of Mendoza's other works becomes obligatory.

The translator leads off (p. xv) by ascribing *Lazarillo de Tormes* to Diego Hurtado de Mendoza, remarking in a curt note that 'doubt has been thrown on the authorship, but without sufficient reason. See Antonio, *Bib. Nov.*, i, 291.' This is much too peremptory, and it assumes what it is the writer's duty to prove. Anybody would think from the reference that Nicolás Antonio had pronounced decisively in favour of the ascription to Mendoza; even if it were so, his opinion would not be final, for the great Spanish bibliographer was not a contemporary, and had no means of obtaining special information on the subject. But, as a matter of fact, and as M. Morel-Fatio has pointed out in a conclusive examination of this ascription to Mendoza, Nicolás Antonio records the attribution in very guarded terms. 'Tribuitur etiam nostro, juvenilis ætatis, ingenio tamen ac festivitate plenus, quem Salmanticæ elucubrasse dicitur, libellus, scilicet: *Lazarillo de Tormes* indigitatus.' And, so far is Antonio from committing himself to a positive opinion, that he

[1] The bibliographical note at the foot of p. xxviii omits about a dozen known editions of *Lazarillo de Tormes*.

continues as follows: 'Quamvis non desit qui Joannem de Ortega, Hieronymianum monachum, hujus auctorem asserat, Josephus videlicet Seguntinus in eius ordinis historiæ lib. I, cap. xxxv.'

Since the publication of M. Morel-Fatio's essay twenty years ago in the first series of his *Études sur l'Espagne*, there is no excuse for misapprehension on the matter. It is now perfectly well known to all who take any interest in the question that the anonymous *Lazarillo de Tormes* was first ascribed to the Jeromite monk, Juan de Ortega, in José de Sigüenza's *Historia de la orden de San Gerónimo* published at Madrid in 1605, and that the attribution to Mendoza was first mentioned two years later by Valère André in his *Catalogus clarorum Hispaniæ scriptorum*, which (as M. Morel-Fatio points out) is the rough sketch of André Schott's *Hispaniæ Bibliotheca* published in 1608. It is worth noting that, in his recast, Schott is careful to tone down Valère André's too positive statement, and mentions the attribution as merely conjectural: 'eius esse putatur satyricum illud ac ludicrum *Lazarillo de Tormes*,' etc. The ascription is mentioned as being current by Tamayo de Vargas in an unpublished bibliography which he compiled in 1622, and Antonio follows Tamayo de Vargas, as Tamayo de Vargas follows Schott, and as Schott follows André. It is plain that there is no real authority for the ascription to Mendoza, and, as M. Morel-Fatio observes, it is significant that it is not so much as mentioned in passing by the editor of Mendoza's poems in 1610, nor by Baltasar de Zúñiga in his life of Mendoza which precedes the first edition of the *Guerra de Granada* published at Lisbon in 1627. Everything points to the conclusion that *Lazarillo de Tormes* is one of several works ascribed at random to Mendoza. It is conceivable, no doubt, that he wrote it; there is nothing chronologically impossible in the attribution: but the presumption is against it, and the burden of proof rests wholly with Sir Clements Markham, and those who agree with him—if there are any such.

Many other points in the introduction invite comment. It is by no means certain that 'the first edition [of *Lazarillo de Tormes*] in Spain was published at Burgos in 1554.' As I pointed out long ago in reviewing M. Morel-Fatio's book the only solid reason for thinking the Burgos edition was the first published in Spain is that the Alcalá edition is described as 'nuevamente impressa, corregida y de nuevo añadida en esta segunda impression'; but this reason is less solid than it seems at first sight, for the Alcalá edition was finished on February 26, 1554, and even if we assume that the Burgos edition was available in the first week of January, we may doubt if it was possible in the sixteenth century to procure the book at Burgos, forward it to Alcalá, reprint it there with woodcuts and textual alterations, and complete the work by the end of February. It is practically certain that the Alcalá edition of *Lazarillo de Tormes* is earlier than the Burgos edition, and that both derive from a previous edition as yet undiscovered: on this point no reasonable doubt is left by M. Foulché-Delbosc's *Remarques sur Lazarillo de Tormes* in the seventh volume of the *Revue hispanique*.

Accordingly, it is not quite clear that a translator is well-advised in basing his version on the Burgos edition which, by the way, was examined by Professor Ottokar Weber on behalf of Dr Wilhelm Lauser some seven or eight years before Butler Clarke, in whose convenient reprint, used by Sir Clements Markham, M. Foulché-Delbosc has noted 92 errors. There is some reason to think that the early translation of *Lazarillo de Tormes* into English was published before 1586 (p. xxix)—perhaps ten years before this date. The translation was licensed in 1568–9, and the unique copy of *Til Howleglas* in the Bodleian Library contains a relevant manuscript note by Gabriel Harvey:—'This Howles-glass, with Skoggin, Skelton, and Lazarillo, given me at London, of Mr Spensar, xx December [15]78.' It would be endless to note misprints, such as 'Inigo' for Iñigo (pp. xv, xvi, xvii, xviii, xix and xx) and 'Albacain' for Albaicin (p. xxiii). Enough has been said to show that these introductory pages are inadequate, and are calculated to mislead beginners very seriously.

JAMES FITZMAURICE-KELLY.

LONDON.

The Origin of the English Nation. By H. MUNRO CHADWICK. (Cambridge Archaeological and Ethnological Series.) Cambridge: University Press, 1907. 8vo. 351 pp.

Mr Chadwick's book is a valuable example of the method which is now likely to lead to the best results in the study of Old English philology and history. The two generations which separate us from the days of Grimm have seen so many keen wits concentrated upon a somewhat narrow field that there is often little left for the philologist pure and simple to do, except to spin new theories out of facts long known and tabulated, which have already yielded to previous workers all that can be legitimately drawn from them. But there is, and there will long be, work for the man who can concentrate upon a single problem the results of several branches of study. This is what Mr Chadwick does: 'In general he' [the author] 'has sought to make use of all branches of ethnological study—history, tradition, language, custom, religion, and antiquities.' When a writer is able to discuss the difficult question of the origin of Angle and Saxon in the light, not only of the Old English dialects, but also of brooch patterns and burial customs his work is certain to be stimulating.

Any attempt to synthetize the evidence as to English origins is, as Mr Chadwick complains, hampered by the backward state of the study of archaeology in England; the neglect of this study offers a striking contrast to the almost exaggerated attention which has been given to certain philological problems; but in spite of this, Mr Chadwick has shown how the evidence of archaeology, folklore and comparative law can be made to supplement and elucidate the evidence of language.

A second edition of the book ought soon to be called for, and, in

view of this, we venture to draw attention to certain points, which might perhaps be reconsidered when the book is reissued. Mr Chadwick states that in Canute's (spurious) Forest Laws, § 33, the *Lex Angliorum et Werinorum hoc est Thuringorum* is referred to under the title of *Lex Werinorum, i.e. Thuringorum.* Now these 'Forest Laws,' the origin of which is obscure, though they are certainly much later than the time of Canute, were first printed in Harrison's description of England, prefixed to Holinshed's *Chronicle* in 1577. Here the passage runs *secundū legem merimorum.* When Holinshed's *Chronicle* was posthumously reissued in 1587 *merimorum* was altered to *Werinorum, i.e. Thuringorum.* Since readers, from Shakespeare downwards, have chiefly used the edition of 1587, this supposed early English reference to the law of the continental Angles has been quoted and requoted. Yet the alteration from *merimorum* to *Werinorum, i.e. Thuringorum* was only a conjecture of Francis Thynne, or of one of his fellow-editors, who knew the great collection of early German laws published by Johann Heroldt at Basle. But Liebermann's[1] discovery, in 1894, of a MS. of the Forest Laws—a MS. of the sixteenth century, but earlier than Holinshed—proves that 'merimorum' is simply a printer's blunder for 'Mercinorum.' The allusion is then to the Mercian law, and the theory that there was any knowledge of the continental Anglian law in England, until it became the common property of antiquarians in the sixteenth century, must be dismissed to that limbo of Pseudo-Germanica where the goddess Hertha reigns.

Again, Mr Chadwick's arguments do not quite support his conclusions when he urges that the life of a German tribe was entirely bound up with that of the King and his retainers: 'What I cannot admit however is that in the total absence of evidence we have any right to assume the existence of a national organization, independent of the King and his officials and retainers....If the King was overthrown, unless some member of the family contrived in one way or another to retrieve its fortunes, the national organization was liable to perish altogether. Such was the case with the Rugii in 488, and with the Thuringi in 531....As a rule we may say that in early times the life of a nation hung together with that of its native dynasty. If the latter was overthrown the nation as a nation ceased to exist' (pp. 171, 172). Undoubtedly this statement represents one side of the truth, but it needs to be very largely qualified. Thus when Guðhere was destroyed in 437 '*cum populo atque stirpe sua*[2],' the Burgundian nation ought, according to Mr Chadwick's view, to have broken up. It did not do so, however, except in saga and poetry: as a fact of history, so soon as the children grew up to manhood, the nation reappeared. We have no evidence that any member of the royal family retrieved the national fortunes: we do not even know that the new dynasty was related to

[1] See article by Liebermann in the *Zeitschrift für Rechtsgeschichte*, XXVIII, 174. *Germanistische Abtheilung.* Liebermann (in his *Gesetze der Angelsachsen*) dates this MS. c. 1570.

[2] Prosper Aquitanus.

the old one, though it is quite likely that it was[1]. And the case of the Rugii, quoted by Mr Chadwick, is really stronger evidence against his view than that of the Burgundians. The Rugian dynasty was not, as Mr Chadwick states, entirely destroyed by Odoacer: the prince Frederic survived and lived to lead the Rugians into Italy under Theodoric. Here, indeed, he perished, about the year 492, and, so far as we know, the Rugian royal line became extinct. But the sequel was the reverse of what Mr Chadwick argues. Living under an Ostrogothic dynasty, and apparently scattered, like their Ostrogothic fellow-subjects, throughout Italy, the Rugians kept their race pure by refusing to intermarry with other tribes, and finally, after the lapse of half a century, in 541, asserted their political existence by electing a king of their own. The evidence of Procopius is conclusive upon this point[2]. Again, the tragic story of the downfall of the Ostrogoths shows clearly that, independent of the royal kin, there was both a national organization and a national spirit. At a critical moment in their war with the Eastern Empire the Goths felt themselves betrayed by the representative of that Amal line to which they had looked for leadership during three centuries. So they deposed him in full assembly, and elected another king, not of royal or even of very noble race. Then, for eighteen years, they kept up the struggle, against two of the greatest generals the world has known; after each successive disaster rallying to, and electing as king, whatever chief seemed best able to maintain the national independence. In this case the nation certainly showed a very vigorous life, apart from its native dynasty, although indisputably the betrayal of the national cause by that dynasty cruelly hampered the nation.

Mr Chadwick's work would probably have been more useful had he shown less originality in his views. When a writer is bringing half a dozen different branches of study to bear upon one subject, he can afford, in each of those branches, to follow the lines which have been generally accepted. Revolutionary theories may be reserved for monographs where the subject can be exhaustively discussed. But, with regard to the chronology of the principal Germanic sound-changes, Mr Chadwick breaks quite away from the orthodox view. He abandons the generally accepted dogma of the early division of the Germanic languages into three great groups, West, North, and East, with East and North linked by a few common characteristics. He divides only into Gothic and non-Gothic. 'There is evidence that it [Gothic] differed greatly from Scandinavian, English, and German alike at a time when the differences between these three languages themselves were insignificant' (p. 64). The sound-changes which differentiate

[1] A member of the later dynasty refers to Gundahari and the kings before him as '*auctores* nostros'; but it has been doubted whether he means more than 'our predecessors.'

[2] De Bell. Gott. III, 2, *οἱ δὲ Ῥογοὶ οὗτοι ἔθνος μέν εἰσι Γοτθικὸν αὐτόνομοί τε τὸ παλαιὸν ἐβίων. Θευδερίχου δὲ αὐτοὺς τὸ κατ' ἀρχὰς προσεταιρισαμένου ξὺν ἄλλοις τισὶν ἔθνεσιν, ἔς τε τὸ γένος ἀπεκέκριντο καὶ ξὺν αὐτοῖς ἐς τοὺς πολεμίους ἅπαντα ἔπρασσον. γυναιξὶ μέντοι ὡς ἥκιστα ἐπιμιγνύμενοι ἀλλοτρίαις, ἀκραιφνέσι παίδων διαδοχαῖς τὸ τοῦ ἔθνους ὄνομα ἐν σφίσιν αὐτοῖς διεσώσαντο. τοῦτον τὸν Ἐράριχον...βασιλέα ἐκ τοῦ αἰφνιδίου οἱ Ῥογοὶ ἀνεῖπον.*

English from Scandinavian on the one hand and from German on the other Mr Chadwick regards as the work of the fifth, sixth and seventh centuries (p. 223). Now, if this could be proved, it would simplify many a knotty problem in the question of the origin of the English race and language. But to prove it would require an independent work: and although Mr Chadwick has elsewhere expressed the same view[1], neither there nor here has he been free to go at all fully into the question. And for two reasons the burden of proof lies upon him. In the first place Professor Bremer's[2] elaborate study of the chronology of the Germanic sound laws holds the field. Bremer thinks that some of the peculiarities which differentiate the dialects of the Old English and Frisian coast tribes from those of their Scandinavian and German neighbours go back to the first century B.C., and the first century A.D.; and his arguments have got to be faced and refuted. In the second place there is a *prima facie* improbability about Mr Chadwick's view. From at least the first century B.C. German tribes had occupied the vast regions from Bavaria to Scandinavia, separated by mighty forests, morasses and arms of the sea: and when literary documents become available we accordingly find wide divergencies of dialect. That all these divergencies sprang up between the fifth and seventh century A.D.: and that from the first century B.C. to the fourth century A.D. either no dialectal peculiarities grew up, or only such as happened later to become obliterated, is certainly very improbable. Mr Chadwick's view is interesting, and an exhaustive discussion of the subject from his pen would certainly be most valuable: but a new and unproved theory ought not to be assumed as a dogma in a work like the present, where space does not allow of its being discussed at length.

Mr Chadwick also breaks away from the accepted view in dealing with another point, which is small enough in itself, yet one upon which a good deal depends, if the history of the Germanic saga and the affinities of different tribes are to be made out: 'I cannot admit that one is justified in assuming the identity of the names Sceaf and Sceafa; for though Beo and Beowa do apparently occur side by side such cases are quite exceptional' (p. 282). On the contrary it would be easy to collect a fair number of cases in which names, especially those of traditional and eponymous heroes are found both in the strong and in the weak form. Thus we have Hreðles (*Beow.*, 2358) against Hreðlan [MS. Hrædlan] (*Beow.*, 454); Scyld in *Beowulf* and Ethelwerd against Sceldwa in the Parker MS. of the *Chronicle*, in Asser, and in Florence of Worcester; Geat in the Parker MS. against Geata in MS. Cott. Tib. A 6 of the *Chronicle*; Hors in the *Historia Brittonum*, against the more usual Horsa. Add to these the Beowa of the charter (Birch, II, 677) against Beaw in the Parker MS., add the O.H.G. instances quoted by Müllenhoff long ago[3], and we certainly have enough examples to justify a belief

[1] *Transactions of the Cambridge Philological Society*, IV, 2 (1899), pp. 259—265.

[2] *Indogermanische Forschungen*, IV (1894), pp. 8—31: 'Relative Chronologie' von Otto Bremer.

[3] *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum*, XII, 260.

that the early King Sceafa of *Widsith* is the same as the Sceaf of the *Chronicle*.

Finally, we differ from Mr Chadwick in his attempt to draw any chronological data from references in Old English heroic poetry to historical persons of the time of the migrations: 'The time,' says Mr Chadwick, 'at which Eadgils, lord of the Myrgingas, lived is fortunately made clear by several passages in Widsith. The poet states (l. 94) that he was in Eadgils' service, and (l. 5 ff.) that in company with Ealhhild, who was apparently either the wife or a near relative of that prince[1], he visited the court of Eormenric, King of the Goths. Eormenric rewarded him for his poetry with a valuable bracelet, which on his return home he gave to Eadgils (l. 90 ff.). It is clear then that Eadgils and Eormenric were contemporaries. But we know from Ammianus Marcellinus that the latter died about the year 370.... Consequently we can hardly go wrong in concluding that Eadgils lived about the middle of the fourth century.'

But this is to neglect the fact that heroic tradition usually represents all its heroes as contemporary, or nearly contemporary, though they may have lived in widely different ages. Thus, to take the stock example, Ragnar Lodbrok is son-in-law, and Gunnarr brother-in-law of Sigurd; yet the historic Ragnar is separated by many centuries from the historic Gundahari. And nowhere is this confusion of periods more obvious than in *Widsith*. Among the retinue of Eormenric (d. 375) Widsith meets Eastgota (fl. c. 250) and Theodric, who is either the Frank (d. 534) or the Ostrogoth (d. 526), as well as Freotheric, perhaps the Rugian, who died about 492. These are engaged in fighting the people of Ætla (Attila) who died in 453. Further Widsith visits Guðhere, who was slain in 437, and Ælfwine (Alboin) who was slain in 572 or 573. *Widsith* is, in fact, a summary of heroic lore, as current at the end of the sixth or the beginning of the seventh century; and in this heroic tradition all great chiefs, who during three centuries had broken into the dying Roman Empire, appear as contemporaries. No chronological argument can be drawn from *Widsith*, or indeed from any heroic poem of a similar kind.

But though we may differ on these, and on other points of detail, from Mr Chadwick, such difference in no way interferes with a very genuine appreciation of his book—a book which treats, in a manner at once original and sane, of topics with which it is not easy to deal without being either commonplace or eccentric.

R. W. Chambers.

London.

[1] This however is very doubtful. Cf. Heinzel in the Vienna *Sitzungsberichte*, cxiv, 514; Jiriczek, *Deutsche Heldensagen*, i, 73; Lawrence in *Modern Philology*, iv, 351.

A Glossary of Wulfstan's Homilies. By Loring Holmes Dodd (Yale Studies in English, xxxv). New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1908. 8vo. 244 pp.

This volume, one of the 'Yale Studies in English,' furnishes Napier's edition of Wulfstan's *Homilies* (Berlin, 1883) with a glossary. We are given the meanings and the various grammatical forms of the words which occur in the editor's critical text only, many interesting expressions which occur in the variant readings being excluded. The glossary scarcely gives the requisite amount of help, as whole phrases and idioms, which are likely to cause difficulty, are left unexplained. It is also vitiated by the compiler's adoption of the antiquated method of dividing verbs into transitive and intransitive, all verbs that are not followed by the accusative being regarded as intransitive. The more logical method would have been to show what verbs require a noun or a noun-equivalent to complete their meaning, which could be done by specifying what case or cases those verbs govern. Verbs such as *helpe* (*his sylfes*) 39/15, *helpan* (*georne earmum mannum*) 119/5, (*heora agenum lustum*) *fullēodan* 106/2, (*ælc ðāra ðe*) *ābyrgð* (*blōdes*) 136/24, (*dēaðes*) *ābyrgan* 149/19, (*ælces unrihtes*) *geswīcan* 142/11, (*men*) *gelēfað* (*tō hwōn Drihtnes sylfes ærendgewrites*) 206/4, (*men ne woldon*) *gelēfan* (*Noes worde*) 206/16, *hlōgen* (*men his worda*) 206/11 etc., which require a noun (sometimes two) or a noun-equivalent in the genitive or dative as a complement, are not logically intransitive. Here and there the meanings of the words are not clearly defined, e.g. *strec* 105/34 means 'mighty' not 'fierce'; *ærāt* 135/2 may mean 'eating too soon'; *unstenc* 139/8 is 'evil odour' not 'stench'; *æmelnys* 139/18 'sloth' not 'false dealing' (see *B.-T. Supplement*); *ofðrihte* 145/4 'oppress' not 'thrust'; *āmolsnian* 147/29 (applied to the eyes) 'decay,' 'loose power' not 'rot'; *gemanian* 148/16 'claim' not 'remind'; and *cōm* in the sentence *hwær cōm ðisse worlde wela* means 'go' or 'become' not 'come.' The various senses of *ðing* are not given. Words like *bred*(*n*) 'board' or 'tablet,' dat. *brede* 146/22, and *sēon*, 3 sg. pr. *sihð* 147/28 are omitted. There are also some errors in analysis, *hēanra* 148/10 is the comp. of *hēan* 'poor' not of *hēah*; *witod* 151/17 is the past participle of *witian*, 'decree' used as an adj. and not another form of the adv. *witodlice*; *āðere* 34/7 is acc. sing. fem. not dat. sing. fem. of *āðor* (*āhwæðẹr*); in the sentence 'ðæt gē ēow tō gamene fēonda āfillað' 132/20 ('strike down') *fēonda* is an acc. pl. form; and *gebyrge* 119/4 is the dat. of **gebyrge* or **gebierge*, a neut. *ja*-stem and not of *gebeorg*. Misprints are numerous. The glossary throws no new light on the many obscure words found in Old English prose and poetry.

O. T. Williams.

Bangor.

Club Law. A Comedy acted in Clare Hall, Cambridge, about 1599–1600. Now printed for the first time from a MS. in the Library of St John's College, with an introduction and notes by G. C. Moore Smith. Cambridge: University Press. 1907. 4to. lviii + 143 pp.

Dr Moore Smith has been fortunate in his researches into the academic drama, and not least so in the recovery of *Club Law*, a scholarly edition of which is now available. For our knowledge of the performance of the play we are indebted to Fuller, for our previous knowledge of the MS. to the sale-catalogue of Farmer's library and an apparently misleading note by Hawkins. It was in the summer of 1906 that Dr Moore Smith discovered, in the library of St John's College, Cambridge, a MS. which seems to have found its way there somewhere between the middle of the eighteenth and the middle of the nineteenth century, and which at once corresponds with that described in Farmer's catalogue and contains a play which is pretty certainly that mentioned by Fuller. Fuller placed the performance in 1597–8; Hawkins, without further specification, said that 'other authorities' assigned it to 1599. The present editor argues strongly for the latter date on the ground of the identification of the characters with real civic dignitaries of the time, and further investigation, since the publication of the play, has finally confirmed this view. Dr Moore Smith has favoured m with an account of the matter.

'*The Date of* Club Law.'

'Fuller assigns *Club Law* to the academical year 1597–8, in the Vice-Chancellorship of Dr John Jegon and the mayoralty of James Robson. This statement is not self-consistent, inasmuch as Robson did not become mayor till a year later. I showed grounds for thinking the true date to be 1599–1600 ("perhaps probably, at the beginning of that mayoral year"). The Vice-Chancellor was then Dr Robert Soame and the mayor John Yaxley.

A footnote in an article by the Rev. Dr H. P. Stokes in the *Benedict* (the magazine of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge) for 1899, which Dr Stokes kindly lent me, directed me to a mention of *Club Law* in a manuscript in the library of Jesus College. This manuscript, now classed R. 3. 42, was kindly found for me by my friend Mr Abbott, the librarian. It is a history of the University of Cambridge in the form of annals. The scheme extends to the year 1645 but the last entry is two or three years earlier. This is probably the date of the manuscript. Here under the year 1599 (i.e. 1599–1600) and under the Vice-Chancellorship of Robert Soame, we find this note:

Aula Clarensis.

Club Law fabula festivissima data multum ridentibus Academicis, frustra Oppidanis dolentibus.

—a very satisfactory confirmation of the date I had arrived at from the internal evidence afforded by the play.

This confirmation, however, became more striking when I found that a note made at the beginning of the book in another hand (perhaps that of the Jesus historian, Sherman) ascribes the manuscript to Fuller himself. The annotator points out that under the year 1620 the author refers to two men as his uncles, who are known to have been uncles of Fuller's. These annals are therefore a preliminary outline of the published history, and the dating of *Club Law* in the latter is probably due to some careless slip.

I think it may now be taken as certain that the date of *Club Law* is the winter of 1599–1600, and that Niphle in the play stands for the Mayor of Cambridge, John Yaxley.'

A large portion of Dr Moore Smith's introduction is occupied with the persistent differences between the Town and Gown, in which *Club Law* formed one rather striking incident. The ground of the whole quarrel was the divided jurisdiction, and it was really a difference among the authorities, though the rabble on either side was ready enough to make this an excuse for indulging its propensities for riot. Much interesting material is here collected to which only passing allusion can be made. The play remains anonymous, though the authorship of George Ruggle is held to be not impossible. To one small point exception may perhaps be taken. Mentioning Macray's remark that one Francis Brakyn is satirized in *Club Law*, the editor adds: 'There is, however, no ground for this statement...and it is unfortunate that it has been perpetuated in the *New English Dictionary*.' The sentence there quoted is merely given for the sake of the expression 'Club-Law,' and as Brakyn's name does not occur, the charge of perpetuating the error seems superfluous.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

Jacques Peletier du Mans (1517–1582). *Essai sur sa vie, son œuvre, son influence.* Par Clément Jugé. Paris: Lemerre, 1907. 8vo. xv + 449 pp.

Cette monographie, consacrée à un précurseur de Ronsard, que les dernières recherches sur la Renaissance ont remis en pleine lumière, a le double mérite de mettre au point les diverses découvertes récemment faites sur Peletier et d'y ajouter de nouvelles et précieuses données.

Dans la première partie, *J. Peletier humaniste et théoricien*, M. Jugé étudie la vie du poète, son œuvre de traducteur, de réformateur de l'orthographe, ses théories littéraires; dans la deuxième partie, *J. Peletier poéte*, il donne une analyse et un commentaire judicieux des divers recueils poétiques; dans la troisième partie, *J. Peletier auteur populaire*, M. Jugé examine et établit quels titres justifient l'attribution à Peletier des *Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis;* dans la quatrième partie, *J. Peletier écrivain*, c'est le style du poète et du prosateur qui est étudié.

Qu'il nous soit permis de présenter tout d'abord quelques critiques.

Une bibliographie commence l'ouvrage; elle apporte de l'inédit; mais on regrette que M. Jugé ait borné ses recherches 'aux bibliothèques de Paris' (p. 1). L'enquête est insuffisante: diverses bibliothèques de province en France et quelques bibliothèques de l'étranger doivent être fouillées, quand on entreprend l'étude d'un écrivain du XVI^e^ siècle. Il est regrettable que M. Jugé n'ait pas donné dans la bibliographie des œuvres de Peletier la description plus complète de l'ouvrage, format, impression, contenu, et la transcription de la feuille du titre: ce sont là des indications qu'exige à bon droit aujourd'hui l'érudition. Par exemple, à propos des *Œuvres poetiques* parues en 1581, les indications trop sommaires de M. Jugé ne me permettent pas de savoir si ce recueil, très rare, est bien de l'édition dont j'ai sous les yeux le détail bibliographique beaucoup plus complet.

Pour les sources, M. Jugé apporte trop souvent des affirmations de seconde main. Il accorde trop d'importance (p. 26) à *La Croix du Maine*, guide très précieux assurément, mais dont les indications sont sujettes à contrôle. P. 115, M. Jugé cite en note un auteur moderne pour nous dire ce qu'il faut penser du talent dialectique de Th. de Bèze: on préférerait avoir le jugement personnel de M. Jugé, qui montre ailleurs dans ses commentaires beaucoup de finesse et de précision.

Faute de se reporter aux sources et de contrôler les dates, M. Jugé a négligé une partie intéressante de son sujet, je veux parler de la renaissance du platonisme et de la part que Peletier y a prise. M. Jugé place en 1547 (p. 183) le mouvement platonicien, se référant sans doute à la date de l'édition des *Opuscules d'Amour*: or les *Opuscules* ne sont que la réimpression collective d'œuvres imprimées dès 1541 et 1542. À plusieurs reprises M. Jugé attribue la renaissance du platonisme aux Lyonnais, ou comme il le dit, à l'école lyonnaise, à la société de Lyon (pp. 184, 207, 232); or, les poètes de Lyon n'ont, ni plus ni moins que d'autres, fait du platonisme la matière de leurs vers, et tout ce qu'on peut discuter, c'est si le Lyonnais M. Scève est plus grand qu'Ant. Héroet 'Parisien.' M. Jugé semble parfois confondre le pétrarquisme et le néo-platonisme, et il est bien vrai que tous deux se font de l'amour une conception à peu près identique: mais le platonisme a devancé le pétrarquisme et lui a survécu; ajoutons que le style d'Héroet est aussi solide et aussi élevé que celui des pétrarquistes est fade et plat. Mais encore quelle fut la part de Peletier dans cette renaissance du platonisme? Ce que dit M. Jugé des relations personnelles de Peletier avec Scève et Pontus de Tyard (pp. 79 et 83), de l'inspiration platonicienne contenue dans les poèmes scientifiques qui suivent *l'Amour des Amours*, ce qu'il dit même de ce petit recueil et des rapprochements à faire avec l'œuvre de M. Scève, toutes ces indications devaient inviter l'auteur à creuser la question; elle est d'un intérêt capital pour l'histoire de la pensée et de la littérature.

Ces réserves faites, il faut reconnaître que l'œuvre de Peletier est vaste et mêlée, et l'on doit féliciter M. Jugé d'avoir mené à bien une entreprise ardue, d'avoir donné aussi à son érudition l'attrait d'un style élégant et d'un exposé toujours lumineux. La biographie de

Peletier est pleine de renseignements nouveaux et curieux; en particulier M. Jugé a apporté des documents précieux sur les relations de Peletier avec Ronsard et du Bellay en 1543, et sur ses fonctions de principal au collège de Bayeux et au collège du Mans.

L'analyse des recueils poétiques est entremêlée d'aperçus exacts et judicieux. La question de l'attribution des *Nouvelles Récréations et Joyeux Devis* à Peletier est reprise et traitée à fond; la discussion est serrée, et la démonstration me paraît définitive; il faut se rallier aux conclusions de M. Jugé: Peletier est l'auteur principal des *Nouvelles Récréations.*

F. Gohin.

Rennes.

MINOR NOTICES.

Professor J. E. Spingarn's *Critical Essays of the Seventeenth Century* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1908. 2 vols.), taken along with *Dryden's Critical Essays,* edited by Professor Ker, fills in the gap between the *Elizabethan Critical Essays,* edited by Professor Gregory Smith and the *Eighteenth Century Essays on Shakespeare,* edited by Professor D. Nicol Smith. The student may now consider that he has the English critical theories of three centuries presented to him in the handiest possible form. Professor Spingarn draws upon a wide range of authors—Bacon, Jonson, Webster, Chapman, Edmund Bolton, Peacham, Drayton, Henry Reynolds, Sir William Alexander, Sir John Suckling, Milton, Davenant, Hobbes, Cowley, Flecknoe, Sir Robert Howard, Sprat, Shadwell, Rymer, Edward Phillips, Joseph Glanvill, Samuel Butler, Lord Rochester, Lord Mulgrave, Lord Roscommon, and Evelyn. The book begins with an Introduction and concludes with terse explanatory notes—in both of which Professor Spingarn avails himself of his profound knowledge of Italian and other continental critical writers with great effect. The Introduction is a masterly and illuminating piece of work, of nearly 100 pages. Its various sections deal with I. The Jacobean Outlook: Bacon and Jonson; II. Early Caroline Tentatives; III. The New Aesthetics: Hobbes and Davenant; IV. The Trend towards Simplicity; V. The Theory of Translation; VI. Wit and Humour; VII. The School of Sense: Rymer; VIII. Poetry and Morals; IX. The School of Taste. Specially interesting is the account of the change in the style of pulpit eloquence given under Section IV. It is perhaps a pity that Professor Spingarn has not supplied an index of the authors and works referred to in his pages. If he had done so, the utility of his book would have been greatly increased.

G. C. M. S.

The second edition of the late Dr R. J. Lloyd's book on *Northern English* (*Skizzen Lebender Sprachen*, I. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1908) differs but little from the first. Now that a knowledge of elementary English phonetics is required of all Normal students, it is a pity that this book does not lend itself better to their requirements. The introductory sections suffer from over-elaboration of definition and the phonetic terminology is unnecessarily large and crabbed. It is this excessive coinage of new words and phrases which has so often made the study of phonetics repellent to the beginner. The system of vowel positions given in § 80—a modified form of it is used in Professor Rippmann's *Sounds of Spoken English*—furnishes much greater difficulties for the average student than Bell's system, and it would have been more satisfactory had the latter been adapted by Dr Lloyd. Some of the space devoted to grammar, both accidence and syntax, which is after all nearly the same for all parts of England, might have been given to a brief discussion of those points in which genuine dialect in different parts of northern England tends to diverge from the standard of educated speech. There are some useful phonetic transcripts in the latter half of the book arranged in descending order of formality—formal (A), careful (B), and careless (C). At least one passage might with advantage have been given in the first two transcripts, A and B, as it would have helped the student to observe the differences of detail. The passages in C are, of course, of too colloquial a character ever to be spoken after the fashion of A or B.

A. M.

The Language and Dialect of the Later Old English Poetry by Jane Weightman (Liverpool: University Press, 1907) is an excellent example of the good work which is being done for English in our provincial universities, a field in which they threaten to outstrip Oxford and Cambridge. The thesis is divided into two parts. The first of these is purely statistical, taking each dialect in turn and observing how often those forms which are typical of certain dialects are used, in comparison with forms belonging to other dialects. More useful and important is the second part which discusses in detail the whole series of sound changes in Old English, whether isolative or combinatory, noting all variations from the normal West Saxon type and explaining irregular forms as far as possible. Here the treatment is full and exhaustive, and one's only regret is that there is no index of the numerous forms discussed. Such an index would make it a valuable handbook of reference for the explanation of dialectal and other difficulties which meet us at every turn in reading Old English poetic texts. At the end of the thesis we have a brief discussion of the dialect of Cynewulf, and though the author agrees with the generally accepted verdict that Cynewulf's dialect is Mercian, she shows that the grounds on which that verdict has hitherto been based are largely untenable. Wülker's conclusions are right, but his premises are wrong. The discussion of

Cynewulf's rhymes is interesting and their evidence is fairly conclusive in favour of his Mercian origin.

A. M.

Of the numerous theses which appear from time to time on different aspects of the *Beowulf* question none are more fruitful and suggestive than those which deal with the history and geography of the poem. In his pamphlet, *Folknamnet Geatas i den fornengelska dikten Beowulf* (Upsala: Almqvist och Wiksell, 1907), Dr Henrik Schück has given an illuminating discussion of the difficult problem of the identity of the Geatas in *Beowulf*. At times he weakens his case by too minute special pleading, but few will be able to dispute the arguments by which he finally identifies the Geatas with the Gautar of Southern Sweden. Incidentally he offers an explanation of a very difficult passage in the well-known voyage of Ohthere as told by Alfred in his *Orosius*. We learn there that when Ohthere sailed from Skiringsal to Hedeby he had Denmark on his port side for the first three days (with the open sea on the starboard) and then for two days Gotland and Sillende and the islands belonging to Denmark on his port side. The confusion of direction is clear. Hitherto it has been explained either by saying (1) that Ohthere is here confusing right and left hand when speaking long after the event—which is very unlikely—or (2) that Southern Sweden was then in the hands of Denmark and that the name of the sovereign country is applied to all its territories, a supposition entirely contrary to the general usage of the time. Dr Schück suggests that Alfred in reporting the narrative of Ohthere has in a moment of confused memory put Denmark where he meant Gotland (i.e., Västergotland in Sweden) and Gotland where he meant Denmark or Jutland. The whole pamphlet is interesting and full of happy illustrations and suggestions, however much we may disagree with some of its author's conclusions.

A. M.

There is nothing very new or original in Dr Louis Round Wilson's dissertation, *Chaucer's Relative Constructions* (*University of North Carolina Studies in Philology*, Vol. I. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1906), though any contribution towards the elucidation of the many untouched problems of Middle English Syntax is welcome. The author has collected a good number of useful examples for the various relative constructions, but it is when he comes to the discussion of some really knotty point that his weakness is apparent. He relies too much upon the citation of secondary authorities without a direct and independent discussion of inferences drawn from the actual facts on which their theories are based. The 'who' in 'as who sayth' is certainly indefinite and not relative, and the author throughout underestimates the importance of the indefinite pronouns and pronominal adjectives 'who' 'which' and 'what' in the development of the corre-

sponding Middle English relative forms. Their development cannot be properly explained by reference either to pure interrogative or pure indefinite forms; they probably result from the influence of both.

A. M.

Professor Capetti, who has been well-known for the last twenty years as an acute student of Dante, here collects together in a volume entitled *L' Anima e l' Arte di Dante* (Livorno, Giusti, 1907) some specimens of his latest work. The seven essays, some of which have been delivered as lectures, have, at first sight, but a very slender thread of connection; yet it may justly be claimed that the title is neither inappropriate nor far-fetched. Whether he treats of Dante's world beyond the tomb, on the broadest lines of comparative anthropology, or of Beatrice, or of the 'Cantos of Pessimism,' or those of 'Hatred,' it is the reaction and interplay of the poet's soul upon his art, and vice versa, that he attempts to illustrate. The author has made a special study of the 'Oltratomba' in Aryan literature; and his essays in other respects show marks of ripe culture and wide learning.

L. R.

From the firm of Olschki in Florence we have received Signor Aluigi Cossio's *Sulla 'Vita Nuova' di Dante* (1908). Written in Manchester, and dedicated to the Roman Catholic Bishop of Salford, to Dr Moore and to William Warren Vernon, by an Italian disciple of R. della Torre and F. X. Kraus, this study of the *Vita Nuova* reflects in its many aspects a many-sided culture. Among its chief merits are a good Bibliography of the subject and an excellent note on Codices, Editions and Translations. There are two concise chapters on the *dolce stil nuovo* and its precursors: the rest of the book is devoted to the *Vita Nuova* itself and to Beatrice, whose literary fortunes are followed through the period of scepticism to the championship of Alessandro D'Ancona and the period of sound reaction. Signor Cossio holds that Beatrice is a real living person as well as an ideal and a symbol, but does not see sufficient reason for identifying her with the daughter of Folco Portinari.

L. R.

The house of Le Monnier has done well to follow the lead of Sansoni, the publisher of the 'Lectura Dantis' delivered in Florence, by issuing two volumes, dealing with the *Inferno*, of *Lectura Dantis Genovese* (Florence, Le Monnier, 1904–6). Each canto has a separate essay devoted to it, delivered as a lecture to the Genoese Scientific and Literary Association. The volumes are prefaced by a preliminary sketch of Dante, the 'Man and the Poet,' by Padre G. Semeria, and the list of contributors includes such convincing names as Del Lungo and Parodi, while the text of each canto has been revised by Giuseppe

Vandelli. F. Buttrini, commenting on the eleventh canto, shows no leanings towards the 'Righettian heresy,' but unconsciously furnishes arguments on the other side.

L. R.

It is almost surprising how much literature appears in English in the course of the year dealing with the life and work of Goethe. New editions of *Faust* are always on the market. Mr Frowde has added the poem, together with Marlowe's *Faustus*, to his *World Library*, with a valuable introduction by Dr A. W. Ward, Messrs Bell have made the old prose version of Hayward the basis of an illustrated *édition de luxe*, and an entirely new translation by Sir George Buchanan (London: Alston Rivers, 1908) has appeared within the past few months. Messrs Blackwood have reprinted the translations of Goethe's lyrics by Sir Theodore Martin and W. Aytoun, which originally appeared, if we are not mistaken, as far back as 1859; Messrs Gowans and Gray have added to their international series a selection of Goethe's *Lyrische Gedichte*, with an Introduction by Professor R. M. Meyer; and Messrs Bell have sent us the revised—and as far as we have tested it, admirably and thoroughly revised—translation of *Dichtung und Wahrheit*, by Miss Minna Steele Smith, which forms two volumes of their *York Library*. This edition has the advantage of a full yet concise bibliographical introduction by Dr Breul, similar to that with which he introduced the translation of *Faust* published in the same series a few years ago. Meanwhile, Professor W. A. Cooper has completed his translation of A. Bielschowsky's *Life of Goethe* (3 vols. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1905–8). It is perhaps open to doubt whether a translation of Bielschowsky can be of great service to the English reader who has not behind him a knowledge of Goethe impossible in one who requires to read the book in translation, and who has not, what is still more difficult for the foreigner to acquire, an understanding of the modern German attitude of mind to Goethe. More is taken on trust by Bielschowsky than a foreign public, unfamiliar with this German standpoint, is willing to accept. Still it would be unfair, now that the work is in English, not to feel grateful to Professor Cooper for his conscientious and careful labours. His English style is unfortunately not always above reproach, but the chief occasion for regret is the prohibitive price at which the book is published—45*s.* for what in the original German costs 14*s.* bound! Surely this is out of all proportion.

From Mr Fisher Unwin we have received a reprint of the translation of H. Düntzer's *Life of Goethe*, by Thomas N. Lyster, originally published in 1883. It seems late in the day to republish a book of this kind, for even in Germany, the methods of Düntzer have happily become an 'überwundener Standpunkt'; and his dry style and inability to discriminate between the important and the unessential are even less likely to find favour with us. But Düntzer contains facts, and it is

perhaps an advantage to have these facts, even so inelegantly 'Englished' as here, for the price of half-a-crown. Lastly, it has to be noted that Lewes's evergreen *Life of Goethe* has been added to Messrs Dent's *Everyman Series*. The new edition is introduced by Mr Havelock Ellis, who, in dealing with the question of Lewes's continued vitality and the correctness of his standpoint, protests, we think, a little too much. It can hardly be denied that Lewes is beginning to date now-a-days, and to date seriously, but not so much in his facts as in his critical judgments: sins of omission are not likely to weigh heavily with foreign readers, who, if anything, are inclined to resent the increasing fullness of our knowledge of Goethe's life and work. Lewes's opinions have often a distinctly 'early Victorian' flavour; and, more frequently than Mr Ellis seems aware, simply reflect the views of the German Hegelian critics who were in the ascendancy when Lewes wrote. But there is plenty of life in Lewes's *Goethe* yet, and an annotated and corrected edition would still be acceptable to English readers.

J. G. R.

NEW PUBLICATIONS.

September—November, 1908.

GENERAL.

Berloin, A., La parole humaine. Études de philologie nouvelle d'après une langue d'Amérique. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

Logeman, H., Tenuis en Media. Over de Stemverhouding bij Konsonanten in moderne talen met een Aanhangsel over de fonetiese verklaring der Wetten van Verner en Grimm. Ghent, E. van Goethem. 8 fr.

Schwietering, J., Singen und Sagen. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht. 1 M. 40.

Soames, L., Introduction to English, French and German Phonetics. New ed. London, Sonnenschein. 6*s.*

Tucker, T. G., An Introduction to the Natural History of Language. London. Blackie. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

ROMANCE LANGUAGES.

Bibliotheca romanica. 47, F. Petrarca, Rime, I trionfi; 48, 49, G. Boccaccio, Decameron, III; 50, P. Corneille, Cinna; 51, 52, L. de Camoẽs, Os Lusíadas, VIII–X; 53, 54, Le Chanson de Roland, d'après le manuscrit d'Oxford; 55–58, A. de Musset, Poésies (1828–33); 59, G. Boccaccio, Decameron, IV; 60, 61, Maistre Pierre Pathelin; 62, 63, G. Leopardi, Poesie, Canti; 64, 65, Chateaubriand, Atala. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz. Each number 10 pf.

Latin.

Ekkehard, Waltharius. Ein Kommentar von J. W. Beek. Groningen, Noordhoff. 2 fl.

Schissel von Fleschenberg, O., Dares-Studien. Halle, Niemeyer. 5 M.

Italian.

Alfieri, V., L' opera poetica, scelta di tragedie e di poesie minori con introduzione, commento e tre saggi critici di N. Vaccalluzzo. Livorno, Giusti. 3 L. 30.

Boccaccio, G., Laberinto d' amore, con un giudizio sull' amore del Boccaccio di G. Carducci. Naples, Soc. Editr. Partenopea. 1 L.

Carducci, G., Conversazioni critiche. Nuova ediz. Naples, Colagrande. 1 L.

Carducci, G., Prose (1859—1903). 4a ediz. Bologna, Zanichelli. 10 L.

Caro, A., Prose scelte pubblicate ed illustrate per cura di M. Sterzi. Livorno, Giusti. 2 L. 60.

Cartwright, J., Baldassare Castiglione, the Perfect Courtier, his Life and Letters. 2 vols. London, Murray. 30*s.* net.

Casini, T., Manuale di storia letteraria italiana. I, i. Dalle origini al trecento. Milan, Soc. Editr. Dante Alighieri. 2 L. 50.

Cossio, A., Sulla 'Vita Nuova' di Dante. Studio critico-letterario. Florence, Olschki. 10 L.

Dante Alighieri, La divine comédie. Trad. et comm. par A. Méliot. Paris, Garnier frères. 7 fr. 50.

Dante Alighieri, Vita Nova, suivant le texte critique de M. Barbi. Trad. et notes par H. Cochin. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

Dante Alighieri, Vita Nuova, together with the Version of D. G. Rossetti. Edited by H. Oelsner. (King's Classics.) London, Chatto and Windus. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Dante e la Lunigiana, Nel VI Centenario della venuta del poeta in Valdimagra. (Biblioteca Letteraria.) Milan, Hoepli. 9 L. 50.

Fornaciari, B., Fra il nuovo e l' antico. Prose letterarie. (Biblioteca Letteraria.) Milan, Hoepli. 6 L.

Italian Poets, chiefly before Dante. The Italian Text with translations by D. G. Rossetti. London, A. H. Bullen. 7*s.* 6*d.*

Martigiani, G., Il romanticismo italiano non esiste. Saggio di letteratura comparata. Florence, Seeber. 3 L. 50.

Negri, G., Opere, Vol. IV. 4a ediz. postuma a cura di M. Scherillo. (Biblioteca Letteraria.) Milan, Hoepli. 6 L.

Novati, F., Freschi e minii del dugento. Conferenze e letture. Milan, Cogliati. 4 L. 25.

Pascoli, G., Le canzoni di re Enzio. I. La canzone de Caroccio. Bologna, Zanichelli. 2 L.

Scrocca, A., Saggi danteschi. Naples, Perrella. 1 L. 50.

Trischitta, G., I canti di G. Leopardi e l' eterno femminino studiato nei due saggi 'Donne reali a creature poetiche' ed 'Estetica della donna.' Messina, Muglia. 2 L.

Provençal.

Anglade, J., Les troubadours, leurs vies, leurs œuvres, leur influence. Paris, Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Mistral, F., Ausgewählte Werke. Übersetzt und erläutert von A. Bertuch. II. Band. Stuttgart, Cotta. 4 M. 50.

Schrötter, W., Ovid und die Troubadours. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Spanish.

Cervantes Saavedra, M. de, Don Quixote. Vollständige deutsche Ausgabe unter Benutzung der anonymen Übertragung von 1837 besorgt von K. Thorer. 3 vols. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 10 M.

Cervantes Saavedra, M. de, Selections from Don Quixote. Edited with notes and vocabulary by J. D. M. Ford. Boston, Heath. 80 c.

Cien Mejores Poesías (Lyricas) de la Lengua Castellana. Glasgow, Gowans and Gray. 1*s.* net.

Fitzmaurice-Kelly, J., Chapters on Spanish Literature. London, Constable. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Lazarillo de Tormes, The Life of, his Fortunes and Adversities. Translated from the edition of 1554 by Sir Clements Markham. London, Black. 5*s.* net.

French.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Dauzat, A., La langue française d'aujourd'hui, évolution, problèmes actuels. Paris, A. Colin. 3 fr. 50.

Geddes, J., Study of an Acadian-French Dialect spoken on the North Shore of the Baie-des-Chaleurs. Halle, Niemeyer. 20 M.

Jaberg, K., Sprachgeographie. Beitrag zum Verständnis des Atlas linguistique de la France. Aarau, Sauerländer. 6 fr.

Körting, G., Etymologisches Wörterbuch der französischen Sprache. Paderborn, Schöningh. 11 M.

Lanson, G., Histoire de la littérature française. 2e éd. Paris, Hachette. 4 fr.

Marthold, J. de. L'argot du xv^e^ siècle, le jargon de François Villon. Paris, Daragon. 8 fr.

Mélanges de linguistique offerts à M. F. de Saussure. Paris, Champion. 10 fr. 50.

Nyrop, K., Grammaire historique de la langue française. iii. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 7 kr.

Tobler, A., Vermischte Beiträge zur französischen Grammatik. iii. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, Hirzel. 6 M.

(*b*) *Old French.*

Settegast, F., Die Sachsenkriege des französischen Volksepos auf ihre geschichtlichen Quellen untersucht. Leipzig, Harrassowitz. 2 M.

Sommer, H. O., Messire Robert de Borron und der Verfasser des Didot-Perceval. Ein Beitrag zur Kritik der Graal-Romane. (Zeitschrift für rom. Phil., xvii. Beiheft.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 60.

(*c*) *Modern French.*

Biré, E., Romans et romanciers contemporains. Paris, Lamarre. 8 fr.

Brandes, G., Anatole France. (Contemporary Men of Letters.) London, Heinemann. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Doumic, R., Études sur la littérature française. vi^e^ Série. Paris, Perrin. 3 fr. 50.

Du Bourg, A., Huysmans intime. Lettres et souvenirs. Paris, Libr. des Saints-Pères. 1 fr.

Ducros, L., J. J. Rousseau. Paris, Fontemoing. 10 fr.

Fénelon, F. de S., Lettre à l'Académie, conforme à l'édition de 1716. Introd. et notes par A. Cahen. 4e éd. Paris, Hachette. 1 fr. 50.

Gribble, F., Rousseau and the Women he Loved. London, E. Nash. 15*s.* net.

Hamel, A. G. van, Het letterkundig leven in Frankrijk. Studien en schetsen. iv^e^ serie. Amsterdam, P. N. van Kampen. 2 fl. 75.

Hodgson, G., Studies in French Education from Rabelais to Rousseau. Cambridge, University Press. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Langlois, E., Nouvelles françaises inédites du xv^e^ siècle. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

Lemaitre, J., J. J. Rousseau. Translated by J. Mairet. London, Heinemann. 10*s.*

Littérature orale et traditions du Nivernais, chants et chansons populaires recueillis par A. Millieu. Paris, Leroux. 15 fr.

Maupassant, G. de, Des Vers. Lettres de Mme Laure de Maupassant à G. Flaubert, poésies inédites. Paris, Conard. 5 fr.

Montaigne, M. de. Gesammelte Schriften. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe. Übertragung von J. J. Bode, herausg. von O. Flake und W. Weigand. II. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.

Musset, A. de, Œuvres complètes. Ed. par E. Biré. Tome IX. Mélanges de littérature et de critique. Paris, Garnier frères. 3 fr. 50.

Musset, A. de, Œuvres. Nouvelles. Paris, Lemerre. 3 fr. 50.

Pascal, B., Thoughts. Selected and translated by M. Kaufmann. Cambridge, University Press. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

Pinvert, L., Sur Mérimée. Paris, Leclerc. 10 fr.

Popp, M., Jules Verne und sein Werk. Vienna, Hartleben. 6 Kr.

Reynier, G., Le Roman sentimental avant l'Astrée. Paris, Colin. 5 fr.

Schiff, M., Éditions et traductions italiennes des œuvres de J. J. Rousseau. Paris, Champion. 2 fr. 50.

Sourian, M., Népomucène Lemercier et ses correspondants. Paris, Vuibert et Nony. 3 fr. 50.

Strowski, F., Pascal et son temps. III. Paris, Plon-Nourrit. 3 fr. 50.

Sully-Prudhomme, Œuvres en prose. Paris, Lemerre. 7 fr. 50.

Tilley, A., From Montaigne to Molière; or the Preparation for the Classical Age of French Literature. London, Murray. 5*s.* net.

Villey, P., Les Sources italiennes de la 'Deffense et illustration de la langue française' de Joachim du Bellay. Paris, Champion. 5 fr.

GERMANIC LANGUAGES.

Frantzen, J. J. A. A., Over den ontwikkelingsgang der erotische lyriek bij de Germaansche volken. Rede. Leyden, A. H. Adriani. 60 c.

Gran, G., Quellen und Verwandtschaften der älteren germanischen Darstellungen des jüngsten Gerichtes. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, XXXI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 10 M.

Hoog, W. de, Franciscus Junius als grondlegger der Studie van het Gotisch en Angel-Saksisch. 2e druk. Dordrecht, J. P. Revers. 60 c.

Jahresbericht über die Erscheinungen auf dem Gebiete der germanischen Philologie. Herausg. von der Gesellschaft für deutsche Philologie in Berlin, XXVIII (1906). Leipzig, Reisland. 10 M.

Scandinavian.

Brandes, G., Levned. III. Snevringer og Horizonter. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 6 kr. 50.

Brennu-Njálssaga (Njála). Herausg. von F. Jónsson. (Altnordische Saga-Bibliothek, XIII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 12 M.

Edda, The Elder or Poetic. Part I. Mythological Poems. Edited and transl. by O. Bray. London, Nutt. 15*s.* net.

Falk, H. S. und A. Torp, Norwegisch-dänisches etymologisches Wörterbuch. Bearbeitet von H. Davidsen. 5.–7. Lieferung. Heidelberg, Winter. 4 M. 50.

Hægstad, M., Norsk maallæra eller grammatik i landsmaalet. 7. utg. Bergen, Nygaard. 50 ö.

Heusler, A., Die gelehrte Urgeschichte im altisländischen Schrifttum (Aus Abhandlungen der preuss. Akad. der Wissensch.). Berlin, Reimer. 4 M.

Holberg, L., Erasmus Montanus. Jeppe fra Bjerget. (F. L. Liebenbergs Text-revision.) Copenhagen, Gad. Each 25 ö.

Molbech, C. og hans Sön C. K. F. Molbech. En Brevveksling. Udg. af O. C. Molbech. Copenhagen, Gyldendal. 5 kr. 50.

Münz, B., Ibsen als Erzieher. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 2 M.

Rönning, F., N. F. S. Grundtvig, II, i. Copenhagen, Schönberg. 3 kr.

Schmitt, E. H., Ibsen als Prophet. Grundgedanken zu einer neuen Ästhetik. Leipzig, Eckardt. 6 M.

Strindberg, A., Werke. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe. VI. Abt., 5. Bd. Ein Blaubuch. Die Synthese meines Lebens, II. Munich, G. Müller. 5 M. 50.

English.

(*a*) *General (incl. Language).*

Dictionary of National Biography. Edited by L. Stephen and S. Lee. Vols. VII–IX. (Re-issue.) London, Smith, Elder. Each 21*s.* net.

Haekmann, G., Kürzung langer Tonvokale vor einfachen auslautenden Konsonanten in einsilbigen Wörtern im Alt-, Mittel- und Neuenglischen. (Studien zur englischen Philologie, X.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M. 50.

Macpherson, W., Principles and Methods in the Study of English Literature. Cambridge, University Press. 2*s.* net.

Petri, A., Übersicht über die im Jahre 1902 auf dem Gebiete der englischen Philologie erschienenen Bücher, Schriften und Aufsätze. (Anglia, XXVII.) Halle, Niemeyer. 4 M.

(*b*) *Old and Middle English.*

Chaucer, G., The Clerkes Tale and the Squieres Tale. Ed. by L. Winstanley. Cambridge, University Press. 2*s.* 6*d.*

Early English Romances in Verse. Done into Modern English by E. Rickert. London, Chatto and Windus. 5*s.* net.

Förster, M., Beowulf-Materialien. 2. Aufl. Brunswick, Westermann. 60 pf.

Pearl, The. A modern version in the metre of the original. By S. Jewett. New York, T. Y. Crowell. 1 dol. net.

Sweet, H., An Anglo-Saxon Reader. 8th ed. London, Frowde. 9*s.* 6*d.*

(*c*) *Modern English.*

Bagehot, W., Estimations in Criticism. Vol. I. Poets and Poetry. London, Melrose. 3*s.* 6*d.* net.

Bayley, H., The Shakespeare Symphony. An Introduction to the Ethics of the Elizabethan Drama. New ed. London, Chapman and Hall. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

Canning, A. S. G., Shakespeare Studied in Three Plays. London, F. Unwin. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

COULTON, G. G., Chaucer and his England. London, Methuen. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

COURTNEY, W. P., The Secrets of our National Literature. London, Constable. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

CRABBE, G., Poetical Works. Edited by A. J. and R. M. Carlyle. (Oxford Edition.) London, Frowde. 3*s.*

CRAIG, R. S., The Making of Carlyle. London, Nash. 10*s.* 6*d.* net.

FOSTER, J., A Shakespeare Word-Book, being a Glossary of archaic forms and varied usages of words employed by Shakespeare. London, Routledge. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

HAMMOND, E. P., Chaucer. A Bibliographical Manual. New York and London, Macmillan. 12*s.* 6*d.* net.

HANCOCK, A. E., John Keats. A Literary Biography. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin. 2 dol. net.

KABEL, P., Die Sage von Heinrich V bis zu Shakespeare. (Palæstra, LXIX.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

LESCHTSCH, A., Richard III. Eine Charakterstudie. (Neue Shakespeare-Bühne, V.) Berlin, H. Paetel. 1 M.

LIENEMANN, K., Die Belesenheit von W. Wordsworth. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

LUBLINSKI, S., Shakespeares Problem im Hamlet. Leipzig, Xenien-Verlag. 2 M.

MÜLLER, P., Die Sprache der Aberdeener Urkunden des 16. Jahrhunderts. Diss. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 2 M. 80.

POE, E. A., Complete Poems. With Introduction by C. F. Richardson. London, Putnam. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

POSCHER, R., Andrew Marvells Poetische Werke. (Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie, XXVIII.) Vienna, W. Braumüller. 5 M.

ROSSETTI, C. G., Family Letters. With some supplementary Letters and Appendices. Edited by W. M. Rossetti. London, Brown. 15*s.* net.

SAINTSBURY, G., A History of English Prosody. From the Twelfth Century to the Present Day. II. Shakespeare to Crabbe. London, Macmillan. 15*s.* net.

SCHÜCKING, L. L., Shakespeare im literarischen Urteil seiner Zeit. Heidelberg, Winter. 5 M.

SHAKESPEARE, W., As You Like It. Edited by F. J. Furnivall. Old Spelling Edition. London, Chatto and Windus. 2*s.* 6*d.* net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., The Tragedy of Richard III. Edited by H. H. Furness. (Variorum Edition, XVI.) Philadelphia, Lippincott. 4 dol. net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., Shakespeare Proverbs, collected by Mary C. Clarke. Edited by W. J. Rolfe. New York, Putnam. 1 dol. 50 net.

SHAKESPEARE, W., in deutscher Ausgabe. Herausg. und zum Teil neu übersetzt von F. Gundolf. I. Berlin, Bondi. 6 M.

SIDGWICK, F., Legendary Ballads. Edited with an Introduction. London, Chatto and Windus. 6*s.* net.

SWIFT, J., The Battle of the Books. Edited by A. Guthkelch. (King's Classics.) London, Chatto and Windus. 1*s.* 6*d.* net.

SWIFT, J., Works. Vol. XII. Edited by Temple Scott. (Bohn's Library.) London, Bell. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Swinburne, A. C., The Age of Shakespeare. London, Chatto and Windus. 6*s.* net.

Tennyson, A., Lord, Becket, and other Plays. London, Macmillan. 4*s.* net.

Thackeray, W. M., Works. Vols. xiii–xvii. (Oxford Edition.) London, Frowde. Each 2*s.*

Thomson, J., The Seasons. Critical Edition by O. Zippel. (Palæstra, lxvi.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

Trevelyan, G. O., The Life and Letters of Lord Macaulay. New Edition. London, Longmans. 3*s.* 6*d.*

Vogt, R., Das Adjektiv bei Ch. Marlowe. Diss. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 1 M. 50.

Watt, L. M., Attic and Elizabethan Tragedy. London, Dent. 7*s.* 6*d.* net.

German.

(*a*) *General* (*incl. Language*).

Bartels, A., Handbuch zur Geschichte der deutschen Literatur. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, Avenarius. 6 M.

Grimm, J. und W., Deutsches Wörterbuch, x, ii, 6. Lieferung. Leipzig, Hirzel. 2 M.

Schroeder, O., Vom papiernen Stil. 7. Aufl. Leipzig, Teubner. 2 M. 40.

Sittenberger, H., Einführung in die Geschichte der deutschen Literatur mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der neueren Zeit. Vienna, Deuticke. 4 Kr.

Tschinkel, H., Grammatik der Gotscheer Mundart. Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Viëtor, W., Deutsches Aussprachewörterbuch. i. Heft. Leipzig, Reisland. 1 M. 20.

Weigand, F. L. K., Deutsches Wörterbuch. 5. Aufl. von H. Hirt. 4. Lieferung. Giessen, Töpelmann. 1 M. 60.

(*b*) *Old and Middle High German.*

Haakh, E., Die Naturbetrachtung bei den mittelhochdeutschen Lyrikern. (Teutonia, ix.) Leipzig, Avenarius. 2 M.

Helwigs Mare vom heiligen Kreuz, nach der einzigen Handschrift herausg. von P. Heymann. (Palæstra, lxxv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 5 M. 50.

Kamp, H., Unser Nibelungenlied in metrischer Übersetzung. Erklärungsausgabe. Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 9 M.

Lexer, M., Mittelhochdeutsches Taschenwörterbuch. 9. Aufl. Leipzig, Hirzel. 5 M.

Reinhart Fuchs. Herausg. von K. Reissenberger. 2. Aufl. (Altdeutsche Textbibliothek, vii.) Halle, Niemeyer. 1 M. 40.

(*c*) *Modern German.*

Altman, G., H. Laubes Prinzip der Theaterleitung. (Schriften der literarhistorischen Gesellschaft Bonn, v.) Dortmund, Ruhfus. 2 M.

Beckmann, K., H. Lindenborn, der kölnische Diogenes. (Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte des Rheinlandes, i.) Bonn, Hanstein. 6 M.

Berger, K., Schiller. Sein Leben und seine Werke. ii. Munich, C. H. Beck. 7 M.

Bloedau, C. A. von, Grimmelshausens Simplicissimus und seine Vorgänger. Beiträge zur Romantechnik des 17. Jahrhunderts. (Palæstra, liv.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

Brinckman, J., Hochdeutscher Nachlass. Herausg. von A. Römer. 2 vols. Berlin, Süfferott. 7 M.

Chamberlain, H. S., Das Drama Richard Wagners. Eine Anregung. Leipzig, Breitkopf und Härtel. 3 M.

Eckermann, J. P., Gespräche mit Goethe. 8. Aufl. Herausg. von H. H. Houben. Leipzig, Brockhaus. 8 M.

Eichendorff, J. von, Sämtliche Werke. Historisch-kritische Ausgabe. Herausgegeben von W. Kosch und A. Sauer. xi. Tagebücher. Regensburg, Happel. 2 M. 50.

Eichentopf, H., Th. Storms Erzählungskunst in ihrer Entwickelung. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, xi.) Marburg, Elwert. 1 M. 60.

Engel-Mitscherlich, H., Hebbel als Dichter der Frau. Dresden, Baensch. 2 M.

Erdmann, J., Eichendorffs historische Trauerspiele. Eine Studie. Halle, Niemeyer. 3 M.

Förster, B., Goethes naturwissenschaftliche Philosophie und Weltanschauung. Annaberg, Graser. 2 M. 80.

Franz, A., Johann Klaj. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Literaturgeschichte des 17. Jahrhunderts. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, vi.) Marburg, Elwert. 6 M. 40.

Geiger, L. Goethe und die Seinen. Quellenmässige Darstellungen über Goethes Haus. Leipzig, Voigtländer. 6 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Aus Goethes Tagebüchern. Ausgewählt und eingeleitet von H. G. Gräf. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 2 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Briefwechsel mit Marianne von Willemer. Herausg. von Ph. Stein. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M.

Goethe, J. W. von, Faust. 2e partie. Trad. en vers de S. Paquelin. Paris, Lemerre. 5 fr.

Goethe, J. W. von, Sprüche in Reimen, Zahme Xenien und Invektiven. Herausg. von M. Hecker. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 2 M.

Haskell, J., Bayard Taylor's Translation of Goethe's Faust. New York, Univ. of Columbia Press. 1 dol. net.

Heinrichs, K., Studien über die Namengebung im Deutschen seit dem Anfange des 16. Jahrhunderts. (Quellen und Forschungen, xiv.) Strassburg, Trübner. 14 M.

Hellmann, H., H. von Kleist. Das Problem seines Lebens und seiner Dichtung. Heidelberg, Winter. 80 pf.

Hoeber, K., Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Sprachgebrauchs im Volkslied des xiv. und xv. Jahrhunderts. (Acta Germanica, vii, i.) Berlin, Mayer und Müller. 4 M.

Humboldt, W. und C. von, in ihren Briefen. Herausg. von Anna von Sydow. iii. Band. Berlin, Mittler. 9 M.

Humboldt, W. von und A. W. Schlegel, Briefwechsel. Herausg. von A. Leitzmann. Halle, Niemeyer. 8 M.

Jahn, K., Goethes Dichtung und Wahrheit. Halle, Niemeyer. 7 M.

KAPP, J., F. Wedekind. Seine Eigenart und seine Werke. Berlin, Barsdorff. 2 M. 70.

KARSEN, F., H. Steffens Romane. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des historischen Romans. (Breslauer Beiträge zur Literaturgeschichte, VI.) Leipzig, Quelle und Meyer. 4 M. 60.

KAULITZ-NIEDECK, R., Goethe und Jerusalem. Giessen, Munchow. 3 M. 50.

KLEIST, H. VON, Sämtliche Werke und Briefe. Herausg. von W. Herzog. I. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 4 M. 50.

KLOB, K. M., Schubart. Ein deutsches Dichter- und Kulturbild. Ulm, Kerler. 4 M.

KRAUSS, R., Das Stuttgarter Theater von den ältesten Zeiten bis zur Gegenwart. Stuttgart, Metzler. 8 M. 40.

KRUMM, J., Die Tragödie Hebbels. (Hebbel-Forschungen, III.) Berlin, Behr. 2 M. 50.

KUMMER, F., Deutsche Literaturgeschichte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Dresden, Reissner. 10 M.

KYRIELEIS, R., M. A. von Thümmels 'Reise in die mittäglichen Provinzen von Frankreich.' (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, IX.) Marburg, Elwert. 2 M. 80.

LEDERBOGEN, F., F. Schlegels Geschichtsphilosophie. Leipzig, Dürr. 4 M.

LONGO, T., L. Uhland, con speciale riguardo all' Italia. Florence, Seeber. 4 L.

MEYER, C. F., Briefe, nebst seinen Recensionen und Aufsätzen. Herausg. von A. Frey. Leipzig, Haessel. 16 M.

MUTHESIUS, K., Goethe und Pestalozzi. Leipzig, Dürr. 4 M. 50.

NIETZSCHE, F., Gesammelte Briefe. IV. Leipzig, Insel-Verlag. 9 M.

PINEAU, L., L'évolution du roman en Allemagne au XIXe siècle. Paris, Hachette. 3 fr. 50.

RAIMUND, F., Ausgewählte Werke. Herausg. von O. Rommel. I. (Deutsch-österreichische Klassiker-Bibliothek, IV.) Teschen, Prochaska. 1 Kr. 20.

REICH, E., F. Grillparzers Dramen. 15 Vorlesungen. 3. Aufl. Dresden, Pierson, 3 M.

REICHEL, E., Gottsched. I. Band. Berlin, Gottsched-Verlag. 8 M. 50.

RICHTER, J. P. F., Werke. Herausg. von R. Wustmann. 4 Bande. Leipzig, Bibl. Inst. 8 M.

SCHAUERHAMMER, A., Mundart und Heimat Kaspar Scheits, auf Grund seiner Reimkunst untersucht. (Hermæa, VI.) Halle, Niemeyer. 6 M.

SCHEUNERT, A., Der junge Hebbel. Weltanschauung und früheste Jugendwerke. (Beiträge zur Ästhetik, XII.) Hamburg, Voss. 12 M.

SCHILLER, J. F. VON. Schillers Dramaturgie. Drama und Bühne betreffende Schriften gesammelt und ausgewählt von O. Falkenberg. (Deutsche Dramaturgie, II.) Munich, G. Müller. 5 M.

SCHILLER, J. F. VON. Schiller und Lotte. Ein Briefwechsel. Herausg. von A. von Gleichen-Russwurm. 2 vols. Jena, Diederichs. 5 M.

SIEBERT, W., H. Heines Beziehungen zu E. T. A. Hoffmann. (Beiträge zur deutschen Literaturwissenschaft, VI.) Marburg, Elwert. 6 M. 40.

SONNTAG, A., H. Lingg als Lyriker. Munich, Lindauer. 2 M.

Stahl, S., Die Entwicklung der Affekte in der Lyrik der Freiheitskriege. Leipzig, G. Fock. 3 M. 50.

Steffens, H., Lebenserinnerungen aus dem Kreis der Romantik. In Auswahl herausg. von F. Gundelfinger. Jena, Diederichs. 6 M.

Trieloff, O. P., Die Entstehung der Rezensionen in den Frankfurter Gelehrten-Anzeigen vom Jahre 1772. (Münstersche Beiträge zur neueren Literaturgeschichte, vii.) Münster, Schöningh. 2 M. 80.

Voss, J. H., Homers Ilias in deutscher Übersetzung. Herausg. von H. Feigl. Vienna, Konegen. 12 Kr. 50.

Walzel, O. F., Deutsche Romantik. Eine Skizze. (Aus Natur und Geisteswelt, 232.) Leipzig, Teubner. 1 M.

Winterfeld, A. von, Friedrich Hebbel. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Dresden, Pierson. 5 M.

PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

La Critica, vi, 5 (September 20, 1908). B. Croce, L' intuizione pura e il carattere lirico dell' arte. B. Croce, Aggiunte agli Appunti bibliografici intorno agli scrittori italiani, dei quali si è discorso nelle 'Note' inserite nelle prime cinque annate della 'Critica' (cont.). G. Gentile, La filosofia in Italia dopo il 1850. iii. I positivisti. 2. Pasquale Villari. vi, 6 (November 20, 1908). B. Croce, Note sulla letteratura italiana nella seconda metà del sec. xix. xxvii. Alberto Cantoni. B. Croce, Aggiunte agli Appunti bibliografici etc. (cont. e fine). G. Gentile, La filosofia in Italia dopo il 1850. iii. I positivisti. 3. Aristide Gabelli.

Modern Language Notes, xxiii, 7 (November, 1908). D. S. Blondheim, A Note on the Sources of Marie de France. K. Campbell, The Source of the Story 'Sapientes' in 'The Seven Sages of Rome.' C. W. Prettyman, 'Clam,' 'Stockfisch' and 'Pickelhäring.' L. Foulet, Thomas and Marie in their Relation to the 'Conteurs.' R. S. Duane, An Error in 'Balaustion's Adventure.' C. H. Handschin, Zu Tells Monolog. J. A. Walz, 'Einen Hasen laufen lassen,' in Goethe's 'Dichtung und Wahrheit.' H. N. MacCracken, Notes suggested by a Chaucer Codex.

Modern Philology, vi, 2 (October, 1908). P. S. Allen, Mediaeval Latin Lyrics, iii. E. B. Reed, Two Notes on Addison. R. E. Neil Dodge, The Well of Life and the Tree of Life. A. S. Cook, 'Pearl,' 212 ff. K. Young, A Contribution to the History of Liturgical Drama at Rouen. C. Goettsch, Ablaut-Relations in the Weak Verb in Gothic, Old High German, and Middle High German, ii. C. R. Baskervill, The Sources of Jonson's 'Masque of Christmas' and 'Love's Welcome at Welbeck.'

Publications of the Modern Language Association of America, xxiii, 3 (September, 1908). W. M. Hart, The Fabliau and Popular Literature. J. M. Burnham, A Study of Thomas of Erceldoune. W. E. Mead, Italy in English Poetry. M. A. Potter, 'Ami et Amile.' H. N. MacCracken, A Source of 'Mundus et Infans.' G. H. MacKnight, The Middle English 'Vox and Wolf.' C. W. Hodell, A Literary Mosaic. W. G. Howard, Christian Wernicke, a Predecessor of Lessing. B. Cerf, A Classification of the Manuscripts of 'Ogier le Danois.'

Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte, viii, 4. M. Döll, Benutzung der Antike in Wielands 'Moralischen Briefen.' R. M. Werner, Historische und poetische Chronologie bei Grimmelshausen, vii, viii (Schluss). R. M. Werner, Grimmelshausens Katholizismus (ix). W. Mühleisen, Französische Vorbilder von J. E. Schlegels 'Stummer Schönheit.' H. Kallenbach, Platens Beziehungen zu Shakespeare. K. Hartmann, Ein verschollenes Elegienbuch aus dem xv. Jahrhundert. R. Petsch, Magierszenen aus einem lateinischen Schuldrama.

Giornale Storico della Letteratura Italiana, lii, 1–2. F. Nicolini, Intorno a Ferdinando Galiani, a proposito di una pubblicazione recente. F. Lo Parco, Pietro de' Cerniti bolognese, maestro di diritto di F. Petrarca. G. Nascimbeni, Sulla morte di Trajano Boccalini. L. Frati, Autoritratti in versi. B. Ziliotto, 'Superbo per ornata prora,' chiosa pariniana. E. Bellorini, Il Monti professore. Supplemento 10–11. E. Solmi, Le fonti dei manoscritti di Leonardo da Vinci.

Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas y Museos, xii, 5-6 (May–June, 1908). M. Menéndez y Pelayo, El Doctor Don Manuel Milá y Fontanals. xii, 7–8 (July–August, 1908). E. Cotarelo y Mori, Noticias biográficas de Alberto Ganasa, cómico famoso del siglo xvi. F. Rodríguez Marín, Cinco poesías autobiográficas de Luis Vélez de Guevara. A. del Arco, Apuntes bio-bibliográficos de algunos poetas granadinos de los siglos xvi y xvii (cont.).

Revue de Philologie Française et de Littérature, xxii, 2, 3. Juret, Étude phonétique et géographique sur la prononciation du patois de Pierrecourt. L. Sainéan, Étymologies lyonnaises (suite). F. Baldensperger, Notes lexicologiques. A. Morize, Voltaire et le Mondain (suite). Fay, Les Gavaches. P. Barbier, fils, Les dérivés romans du latin *sargus*. G. A. Parry, 'Les énigmes de l'amour' de Pierre Sala. A. Guérinot, Une interprétation erronée du 'Grand Testament' de Villon, Strophe 6. J. Bastin, Le verbe 'être' conjugué avec lui-même. L. Seguin, Sur un mot de Mme. de Sévigné.

Revue des Langues Romanes, September–October, 1908. P. Barbier, Noms de poissons, Notes étymologiques et lexicographiques. F. Castets, Les quatres fils Aymon (suite). L. Lambert, Chants de travail : métiers, cris des rues (suite). G. Bertoni, 'Mainte communalment.'

Romanische Forschungen, xxv, 1. W. Benary, Zwei altfranzösische Friedensregister der Stadt Tournai (1273–1280). R. Kiessmann, Rostand-Studien. O. Borrmann, Das kurze Reimpaar bei Chrestien von Troyes mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des 'Wilhelm von England.' xxv, 2. F. Werner, Königtum und Lehenswesen im französischen Nationalepos. F. Baumann, Über das Abhängigkeitsverhältnis Alberto Notas von Molière und Goldoni. G. B. Festa, Bibliografia delle più antiche rime volgari italiane.

Zeitschrift für französische Sprache und Literatur, xxxiii, 5–7. E. Brugger, L'Enserrement Merlin. Studien zur Merlinsaga, iii. K. Körner, Über die Ortsangaben in 'Amis und Amiles.' J. Priebsch, Drei altlothringische Mariengebete. A. Morize, Samuel Sorbière (1610–70). D. Behrens, K. Ettmayer, R. Haberl, Wortgeschichtliches.

Zeitschrift für romanische Philologie, xxxii, 5. Th. Kalepky, Koordinierende Verknüpfung negativer Sätze im Provenzalischen. F. Settegast, Die fränkischen Elemente der Mîrmans Saga. P. Skok, Cantare in französischen Ortsnamen. G. Bertoni, Sur le texte de la 'Pharsale' de Nicolas de Vérone. H. Schneegans, Sizilianische Gebete, Beschwörungen und Rezepte in griechischer Umschrift. G. Bertoni, Revisione del canzoniere francese di Berna. F. Settegast, Über einige Eigennamen des Floovant bezw. Fioravante. R. Ortiz, In cima del doppiero. R. Piccoli, L' assonanza dei vers orphelins in 'Aucassin et Nicolette.' A. Horning, Abruz. *anda*, sicil. *antu*. S. Puşcariu, *aroà*, *arcò*. W. Meyer-Lübke, Zur Verbreitung von *afflare*.

ANGLIA, XXXI, 4. A. L. Stiefel, Die Quellen der englischen Schwankbücher des XVI. Jahrhunderts. O. B. Schlutter, Anglo-Saxonica. E. A. Kock, Das Recht und die Pflicht eines Textherausgebers. E. Einenkel, Nachträge zum 'englischen Indefinitivum.' A. Pogatscher, Zu 'Anglia,' XXXI, 260, 266.

BEITRÄGE ZUR GESCHICHTE DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE UND LITERATUR, XXXIV, 2. R. C. Boer, Attilas Tod in deutscher Überlieferung und die Hvenische Chronik. R. M. Meyer, Hilfsverba zweiter Ordnung. K. Helm, 'Von dem übelen wîbe.' A. Spamer, Zur Überlieferung der Pfeiffer'schen Eckeharttexte. B. Kahle, Das Motiv von der wiedergefundenen Schwester im Altisländischen.

ENGLISCHE STUDIEN, XXXIX, 3. M. Förster, Beiträge zur altenglischen Wortkunde aus ungedruckten volkskundlichen Texten. E. Björkman, Über den Namen der Jüten. O. Emmerig, Dariusbrief und Tennisballgeschichte. W. J. Lawrence, The Situation of the Lords' Room. E. Borst, Pro-Infinitive.

EUPHORION, XV, 1–2. A. Wesselski, Johann Sommers 'Emplastrum Cornelianum' und seine Quellen. F. Hahne, Paul Gerhardt und August Buchner. A. Warda, F. H. Jacobi und der Verfasser der 'Lebensläufe.' R. Buchwald, Goethes 'Triumph der Empfindsamkeit.' L. Bobé, Findlinge aus dänischen Privatarchiven. A. Leitzmann, Zu Lichtenbergs Briefen. K. Freye, Die Studien zu Jean Pauls zweitem Eheroman. H. Meyer-Benfey, Die innere Geschichte des 'Michael Kohlhaas.' J. Černy, Jacques Cazotte und E. T. A. Hoffmann. G. Pfeffer, J. G. Regis, 'Mein Bekenntniss über den zweiten Theil von Göthes Faust' (1835). VII. Ergänzungsheft. A. Hauffen, Neue Fischart-Studien.

JOURNAL OF ENGLISH AND GERMANIC PHILOLOGY, VII, 2 (April, 1908). O. E. Lessing, In Memoriam Gustaf E. Karsten. G. E. Karsten, Germanic Philology; Über das amerikanische Schulwesen; The German Universities; Notes on Goethe's 'Faust'; Die Sprache als Ausdruck und Mitteilung; Folklore and Patriotism; Rede am Deutschen Tag in Chicago, 1907; Bismarck. The Writings of G. E. Karsten. E. Mogk, Elseus Sophus Bugge. G. T. Flom, Contributions to the History of English. E. C. Wilm, The Kantian Studies of Schiller. F. N. Scott, A Note on Walt Whitman's Prosody.

REVUE GERMANIQUE, IV, 5 (November-December, 1908). C. Cestre, 'The Church of Brou' de Matthew Arnold. A. Ravizé, Lettres inédites de Freiligrath.

ZEITSCHRIFT FÜR DEUTSCHES ALTERTUM UND DEUTSCHE LITERATUR, L, 1–2. C. von Kraus, Virginal und Dietrichs Ausfahrt. H. Schönhoff, Reinolt von der Lippe. G. Baesecke, Kudrun, Str. 101–102, und Heinrich der Löwe. E. Schröder, Ockstädter Fragmente: I. Aus dem Willehalm; II. Aus einem geistlichen Gedichte (?). W. Wilmanns, Zum Rolands- und Alexanderliede. H. Fischer, 'Barditus.' A. Bömer, Fragmente einer gereimten deutschen Boethiusübersetzung. H. Laudan, Die halbe Birne nicht von Konrad von Würzburg. J. Klapper, Altdeutsche Texte aus Breslau: I. Bruchstücke einer poetischen Bearbeitung des Pseudo-Matthäus; II. Büchlein von der Himmelfahrt Mariae; III. Paraphrase der Sequenz 'Ave praeclara maris stella'; IV. Minnelied; V. Zum deutschen Kirchenliede; VI. Leonhard Assenheimer, historisches Volkslied vom Jahre 1446. A. Wallner, Kürnbergs Falkenlied. A. Wallner, 'Eiris sazun idisi.' E. Schröder, Zum Armen Heinrich. C. von Kraus, Das Akrostichon in Gottfrieds Tristan. E. Schröder, Galmei.